DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 099 JC 840 123

AUTHOR Lee, Beth S.
TITLE Follow-Up of Occupational Education Students: Los Rios Community College District, Spring 1983.
INSTITUTION Los Rios Community Coll. District, Sacramento, Calif.
PUB DATE Feb 84
NOTE 77p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Graduates; College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Dropouts; Education Work Relationship; Employment Patterns; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education; Vocational Followup

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study of occupational education students in the Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD) was conducted to obtain information regarding the former students' educational and career goals, employment and educational status, and perceptions of the programs and services offered by the three district colleges. A survey was mailed to 2,700 former LRCCD students who had been enrolled in fall 1981 or spring 1982 in a course designated as occupational and who had not re-enrolled in fall 1982. Two subgroups were studied: those who completed an associate or certificate program (graduates) and those who received no award (non-returning students). Study findings, based on responses from 1,291 (51.8%) of the former students, revealed: (1) about 60% of the respondents had enrolled primarily to acquire or improve job skills; (2) 28% of the non-returning students indicated that their reason for not returning was completion of the courses they needed and 15% cited conflicting job hours; (3) 75% of the respondents were employed full-time, and 40% of the graduates and 30% of the non-returning students were furthering their education; and (4) among the employed respondents, almost 70% were working in a job related to their college courses. The survey instrument, cover letters, and detailed response data are appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241099

Follow-up of Occupational Education Students Los Rios Community College District Spring 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Beth S. Lee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Beth S. Lee, Ed.D.
Faculty Research Associate
February 1984

Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court Sacramento, CA 95825

JC 840 123

FOLLOW-UP OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
SPRING 1983

Beth S. Lee, Ed.D.
Faculty Research Associate

Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court
Sacramento, CA 95825

February, 1984

2A

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to many people whose contributions of time and effort were an indispensable part of this study.

The survey itself was conducted under the direction of of a steering committee which included Patricia O'Brien, Los Rios District Director of Vocational Education and Special Services, and the Deans of Occupational Education at the three district colleges: Carrie Douglas, American River College; Robert Allerton, Cosumnes River College; and Norval Wellsfry, Sacramento City College. The actual survey procedures were handled primarily by each dean's secretary: Gerry Abeel at ARC, Susan Burns at CRC, and Dorothy Fauth at SCC. Periodic consultation with staff involved in research at the colleges--Sharon Ruckle and Richard Rasor (ARC) and Nancy Renkiewicz (SCC)--was also very helpful.

Data analysis was accomplished with the assistance of the District Data Processing staff, directed by Paul Steed. Special thanks go to Pat Finley for help in setting up the program and use of the Honeywell computer terminal, to Randy Jones for technical assistance with WordStar and the Apple II microcomputer, and to Larry Lee for advice in special applications of SPSS.

Valued support for the project was provided by Los Rios District administrative staff: Chancellor David Mertes, Vice Chancellor Owen Stewart, and Directors of Education and Planning Marshall Drummond and Janis Cox Coffey.

Finally, very special thanks go to the many former students of Los Rios who took the time to complete a rather lengthy questionnaire about the value of their college experience, providing the data reported here.

B.S.L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

LIST OF TABLES iv

SPRING 1983 FOLLOW-UP OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
IN THE LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

INTRODUCTION 1

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
Demographics 2
Major Fields of Study 2
Educational Objectives 2
Current Educational/Employment Status 3
Satisfaction With College Experience 4

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 5

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 5
Cross-Sectional Follow-Up Surveys 6
Longitudinal Follow-Up Surveys 6
Use of Follow-Up Data in Educational Planning 7

DESIGN OF THE STUDY 8
Survey Population 8
Survey Instruments 8
Survey Procedures 9
Survey Responses 10
Data Analysis 10
Check for Non-Response Bias 11

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 11
Method Used to Determine Major 11
Number of Responses 12

RESULTS OF THE STUDY 13

Part 1: DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL INFORMATION 13
Distribution by Gender 13
Distribution by Ethnicity 13
Distribution by Age Groups 15
Major Fields of Study 15
Primary Objective in Attending Our Two-Year College 17
Current Educational/Employment Status 17

Page

Completion of Educational Objective 17
Principal Reason for Not Re-enrolling and Feeling About Educational Experience 19
Ratings of Major Programs of Study/College Services 19

Part 2: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION 23
Employer Information 23
Relationship of Job to Courses Completed 23
Reasons for Employment Outside Area of Preparation . 23
Prior Employment in Occupational Area 25
Current Salary 25
Hours of Employment Per Week 25
Usefulness of Training in Performance of Job 27
Help Provided by Courses in Occupational Area . . . 27
Recommendations to Others Similarly Employed 27
Rating of Job Availability in Occupational Area . . 27

Part 3: EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION 30
College Information 30
Problems in Transferring 31
Credit Hours (Units) Transferred 31
College Status and Classification 31
Credit Hours (Units) Completed 31
Rating of Preparation for Continuing Education . . . 34

Part 4: FUTURE PLANS 34
Relationship of Courses Taken to Career Plans . . . 34
Interest in Additional Courses 36
General Comments 36

CONCLUSIONS 36

RECOMMENDATIONS 37

REFERENCES 39

APPENDIX 41
Survey Forms: Graduates/Nonreturning Students 42
Cover Letters 44
Survey Response Rates 46
Responses by Major/Cross-Reference Codes 47
Suggestions for Implementing Recommendations 50
Summary of Data Elements 53

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Distribution by Gender	14
2	Distribution by Ethnicity	14
3	Distribution by Age Group	16
4	Primary Objective in Attending Our Two-Year College	18
5	Current Educational/Employment Status	18
6	Extent to Which Objective Has Been Completed/ Plan to Pursue Objective Further	20
7	Education Required to Accomplish Educational Objective	20
8	Principal Reason for Not Reenrolling at Our College This Semester	21
9	Feeling About College Educational Experience	21
10	Ratings of Courses in Major Field of Study and College Services	22
11	Is Job Related to Courses Completed at Our College?	24
12	If Not Employed in Occupational Area Related to Courses Completed, Why Not?	24
13	Employed in Your Occupational Area Prior to Enrollment at Our College?	24
14	Current Salary (Gross, Without Overtime)	26
15	Hours of Employment Per Week	26
16	Rate Training Received at Our College as to Its Usefulness in Performance of Your Job	28
17	Did Courses in Your Occupational Area Help in Any of These Ways?	28
18	Recommend Course(s) Taken at Our College to Others Employed in Positions Similar to Yours?	29
19	Rate Availability of Jobs in Your Occupational Area	29

Table		Page
20	Transfer Colleges	30
21	Problems Transferring to Another College	32
22	Credit Hours (Units) Earned at Our College, Not Accepted at Transfer College	32
23	Current Status/Classification at Present College	33
24	Credit Hours (Units) Completed at Our College	33
25	How Well Did Courses Completed at Our College Prepare You for Continuing Your Education?	35
26	Were Course(s) Completed at Our College Beneficial to Your Career Plans?	35
27	Interested in Taking Other Courses at Our College?	35

SPRING 1983 FOLLOW-UP OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

INTRODUCTION

This report represents the first phase of a coordinated district-wide plan to improve student follow-up research in the Los Rios Community College District (Sacramento, California). Established as a district in 1965, Los Rios serves the residents of Sacramento and El Dorado counties as well as portions of Yolo, Placer and Solano counties through its three colleges: American River College, Cosumnes River College, and Sacramento City College, and numerous outreach centers. It is the third largest community college district in California in terms of credit enrollment, which totals approximately 46,000 students.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to gather data about former occupational education students as required for the Federal Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) and other reports and for use in district and college planning. Information was also obtained regarding former students' educational and career goals, employment and educational status, and perceptions of the programs and services offered by the three colleges in the district.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey of 2,700 former students of the Los Rios Community College District was conducted in Spring 1983. The survey population included all former Los Rios students who had been enrolled at a district college during Fall 1981 or Spring 1982 in a course or courses designated as "occupational" and who had not reenrolled at the same college in Fall 1982.

Two subgoups were studied: those who had completed an associate degree or certificate (referred to as GRADs) and those who had received no award (nonreturning students or NRSs). Responses were received from 1,291 former students, for an adjusted response rate of 51.8%.

The survey utilized the questionnaires and processing services of the Center for Information Services, commonly referred to as the Tex-SIS (Student Information System) Follow-Up System, and the data were further analyzed using SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Major findings of the survey are summarized below and are discussed in detail in the sections which follow.

Educational Objectives

Respondents were asked to indicate their PRIMARY objective in attending a two-year college, and their answers reflect the fact that the survey population had been selected because of their enrollment in "occupational" courses:

* Approximately 60% of respondents (58% of the GRADs and 65% of NRSs) had enrolled primarily to acquire or improve job skills (Table 4).

* University transfer was listed as their primary objective by more than 30% of GRADs and 16% of NRSs (Table 4).

* More than 15% of all respondents cited "other personal reasons" as their primary goal.

Among nonreturning students,

* More than 43% reported they had enrolled only for selected courses; 32% indicated their goal required an associate degree, and almost 20% had planned to earn a certificate (Table 7).

* Even though they did not receive a degree or certificate, 34% of the NRSs indicated they had completed their educational objective, and almost 56% reported partial completion (Table 6). Of those planning to pursue their objective further, 53% reported they would return to the same college to do so.

* When asked their "principal reason for not reenrolling at our college" (Table 8), almost 28% indicated they had completed the courses they needed. Nearly 15% cited conflicting job hours, and another 7% said they had found employment in a related occupation. More than 9% had transferred to another college; 8.6% left due to personal/family reasons, and 6% for financial reasons. Only 5.6% indicated a problem related to courses, grades or instruction.

Current Educational/Employment Status

More than 75% of all respondents (73% of GRADs; almost 79% of NRSs) were employed full-time when they completed this survey (Table 5), and approximately 15% reported they were not in the labor force and not seeking employment. While 9.5% of the GRADs and 9.0% of NRSs were "unemployed but actively seeking employment," this compared favorably with the 11.8% unemployment rate reported for the Sacramento area as a whole in March 1983.

Almost 40% of responding GRADs and more than 30% of NRSs reported they were currently enrolled in further education at the time of this study. These figures, together with those above regarding employment, indicate that a substantial number of respondents were apparently both working and attending college (Table 5).

Among respondents who were employed at the time of this survey (73% of GRADs and almost 79% of NRSs),

* Almost 70% were working in a job related to the college courses they had completed (Table 11).

* When GRADs were asked why they were working in a field unrelated to their major (Table 12), 40% checked "transfer to a four-year college" as their reason. However, almost 20% reported they were unable to find employment in their field, and another 10% felt they were not sufficiently qualified for work in that field.

* While 65% of the NRSs had been employed in their field prior to enrolling, this was true for only 42% of the GRADS (Table 13).

* NRSs were more likely than GRADs (82% to 71%) to be working 35 or more hours per week (Table 15).

* Nonreturning students in most categories reported earnings greater than those reported by comparable graduates: NRSs averaged $1,647 while GRADs averaged $1,545 per month for full-time employment (Table 14). These salary differentials may be due the fact that NRSs averaged more than three years older than GRADs (Table 3) and were more likely to have been previously employed in their field and to be working full time (Tables 13 and 15).

* The usefulness of college training in performance of their job was rated good or very good by more than 69%, and another 25% gave an "average" rating on this item (Table 16).

* Almost 80% reported that courses completed in their occupational area had helped them either to obtain their job, or to perform or advance on the job (Table 17), and 76.4% said they would recommend the courses they had taken to others similarly employed (Table 18).

Among respondents who were attending college at the time of this survey (almost 40% of GRADs and more than 30% of NRSs),

* More than 68% of the GRADs and 37% of the NRSs were juniors, while 24% of the GRADs and more than 36% of the NRSs had senior or graduate student status; approximately 26% of the nonreturning students had transferred as freshmen or sophomores (Table 23). More GRADs (68%) than NRSs (49%) attended full-time.

* More than 55% had transferred to a CSU institution and 3.5% to the UC system; 29% were enrolled in a Los Rios college (Table 20).

* More than 88% who had transferred to another college reported they encountered no problems in making the transition (Table 21).

* Almost 73% considered their preparation for continuing their education to be excellent or satisfactory (Table 25).

Satisfaction with College Experience

Respondents to the survey gave their college experience favorable ratings in a variety of other ways:

* Almost 83% reported they were satisfied or very satisfied with their educational experience (Table 9). On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 representing the highest degree of satisfaction), the average rating for each college in the district was 4.1 or above.

* The quality of instruction, instructor interest, and course content, as well as library and veterans services, received ratings of well above 4.0 on the same scale; virtually all educational programs and support services were rated 3.5 or above (Table 10). Ratings by GRADs and NRSs were very similar.

* Approximately 81% indicated the courses they completed were of direct benefit to their career plans, and another 17% considered them to be of indirect benefit (Table 26).

* More than 65% of all respondents expressed an interest in returning to the same college to take other courses in the future (Table 27).

Demographics

The results of this study revealed such a diversity among former students that it would be misleading to describe a "typical" respondent. However, demographic profiles can be drawn of the two subgroups studied.

* In the GRAD group a slight majority (51%) were females, while the majority of NRSs who reported their gender were male (Table 1).

* The average age of all GRADs was 30, while NRSs averaged 33.3 years of age (Table 3). Nearly 40% of GRADs and 25% of NRSs were age 24 or younger; almost 37% of GRADs and 52% of NRSs were 30 or older.

* Ethnic differences were greater among the colleges than between the two groups: district-wide almost 74% of GRADs and 78% of NRSs were white, but comparable percentages at the colleges ranged from 82-86% white at ARC to 74-75% at CRC and 58-67% at SCC. Ethnic distributions among the three colleges were very diverse (Table 2).

Major Fields of Study

* While the design of this study assigned an occupational major to each person in the survey, actual majors reported by respondents included a substantial number in general education or liberal arts.

* Since as many as 40% of the assigned majors may be incorrect, the computer summaries by major should be used with caution.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

A follow-up study of students previously enrolled in courses designated as "occupational education" has been conducted annually by each college in the Los Rios District for many years in order to fulfill federal and state reporting mandates and to provide information for college planning. These surveys have generally included all vocational programs offered at each college, rather than just those (approximately 25%) for which annual reporting is required.

In Fall 1982, the annual survey of occupational education students was designated as the first phase for implementation of a more comprehensive long-range plan for district-wide student follow-up of Los Rios students. While a common questionnaire had been used for the annual occupational student survey for many years, procedures for conducting the study and for reporting the results had traditionally been determined by the individual colleges. For this pilot effort, college and district administrators agreed to follow common procedures in conducting the Spring 1983 survey and to use the questionnaires and processing services of the Center for Information Services, commonly known as the Tex-SIS (Student Information System) Follow-Up System. In addition to providing all information required for federal and state reporting, the Tex-SIS questionnaires also elicited information on 24 additional data elements useful in educational planning and research.

Other related research conducted recently in the Los Rios district has included a follow-up of alumni three years after leaving college (Rasor and McGill, 1981); a survey of the opinions and goals of enrolled students (Rasor, 1982); an examination of why students withdraw from classes and from college (Rasor, 1980); and a comprehensive study of reverse-transfer students attending Los Rios colleges (Renkiewicz and others, 1982). In addition, Sacramento City College was one of the colleges included in the Statewide Longitudinal Study of California community colleges conducted from 1978 through 1981 (Sheldon, 1982), and American River College is currently part of a state pilot project to follow up on vocational education students which is now nearing completion (Brooks, 1983).

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Follow-up studies of former students abound in community college literature; files of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) contain reports of more than 2,000 such surveys conducted within the last ten years. These studies vary with regard to the populations surveyed, the sources from which data are collected, and the questions they seek to answer. Babbie (1973) suggests that they may also be categorized by the research design used: cross-sectional, longitudinal, and the use of cross-sectional surveys to approximate longitudinal ones. A few of the major reports examined in preparation for the present study are described below.

Cross-Sectional Follow-Up Surveys

Lansing (Michigan) Community college studied a stratified sample of 3,000 former students to determine the extent to which students had achieved their educational goals and/or improved their employment status through college attendance (Smolen and Bettinson, 1979). Of those responding, 41% indicated an employment-related objective, 34% a transfer objective, and 25% had attended for a variety of other reasons.

A random sample of first-time freshmen who had entered San Jose (California) City College in Fall 1973 was studied in 1978 to assess the former students' preparation for the job market and/or for transfer to senior institutions (Guthart, 1978). Data were gathered from student records, college registrars, and questionnaires. Findings indicated that while 46.7% had intended at entrance to get an associate degree, only 2.2% had done so after 3.5 years; 26% had earned no credit at SJCC.

The Los Angeles Community College District gathered data for its biennial surveys (1976, 1978, 1980) through in-class administration of questionnaires to students enrolled at specific hours in day and evening programs. While an 80% response rate was achieved, the sample was found to include more young, full-time students and fewer minorities than the district's general enrollment. However, a comparison of the results of each survey with previous studies provided useful planning information.

Longitudinal Follow-Up Studies

The Statewide Longitudinal Study (Sheldon, 1982), a comprehensive study of California community college students, used college records and structured telephone interviews to gather data on 6,550 students from 15 community colleges for three years. A major contribution of this study was the use of 18 student prototypes to describe the diversity in motives, enrollment patterns, aspirations and achievements of students formerly designated simply as transfer, vocational, or "special interest" groups. The prototypes were validated by the students themselves and by subsequent studies. Sheldon recommends that as community colleges seek to establish priorities among the various missions they now espouse, the decisions should be made by the local colleges using the most accurate research data available.

An important longitudinal study by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (1979) followed a sample of 35,000 California community college students for three and one-half years and focused on factors affecting transfer to a four-year university. The report concluded that California community colleges seem to have become bifurcated institutions: traditional two-year colleges with programs leading to degrees for transfer, and postsecondary institutions for older, part-time students with different objectives.

A major problem inherent in longitudinal follow-up of students is the depletion of the survey panel caused by mobility of the subjects. This was evident in a longitudinal study of student flow and persistence

begun at Santa Ana (California) College in Fall 1977 (Slark, 1978). Planned as a five-year effort, the study was discontinued after three semesters when SAC joined the Statewide Longitudinal Study described above. Meanwhile, the initial panel of 629 students had dwindled to 151 (24%) by the beginning of the fourth semester, and not all of these had been continuously enrolled.

Many colleges periodically survey all members of a target group and then compare the results with similar studies conducted previously to identify trends in student goals and accomplishments, thus avoiding some of the problems found in cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys. This method is particularly useful when comparisons can be made with district or statewide data gathered by the same survey instruments.

An outstanding statewide program for surveying community college students is the Tex-SIS Follow-up System, used by postsecondary institutions in Texas and in a number of other states (Hall and Reed, 1979; DeVault and Lee, 1978; Corbitt, 1979). The system includes fourteen different forms which colleges may use to survey various populations: entering or returning students; those who withdraw from courses or from college, or who leave without formally withdrawing; program graduates; nonreturning students who complete a term but receive no formal award; continuing education students; and employers of former students. Results are summarized for each college and for the state as a whole.

Another comprehensive statewide program, the Hawaii Student Flow Project (U.S. Office of Education, 1978) has surveyed former community college students and their employers in various ways. Oregon, Kansas and Illinois have also conducted statewide follow-up studies.

Use of Research in Educational Planning

Information gathered through follow-up research is valuable only to the extent that it is used. A nationwide survey of community college follow-up studies (Williams and Snyder, 1974), found that while 87% of the 522 responding colleges reported having conducted such surveys, about half of those were informal studies without written reports.

Bers (1980) identified some of the major problems regarding integrating survey results into the institutional planning process and made recommendations for colleges contemplating such research. The Maryland State Board for Community Colleges (1983) conducts systematic follow-up and evaluation of programs offered in that state using quantitative data gathered at the state level and qualitative assessment by individual colleges to monitor their offerings. The Southern Regional Education Board (1978) has published a set of procedures and a common core of questions for community college follow-up surveys, with recommendations on the use and distribution of survey results to interested parties.

The recommendations made by these and other researchers have been followed whenever possible in conducting the present study, and some are included in the Recommendations section of this report.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Survey Population

The list of students to be surveyed was determined by a district computer program following guidelines set forth in the Student Accountability Model (SAM) Operations Manual (Revised 1981) published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. It identified students who:

1) Were enrolled, during either Fall 1981 or Spring 1982, in a college course or courses designated as "occupational" according to the SAM matrix; and

2) Did not reenroll in the same college during Fall 1982.

Students were also identified as to their completion status: Graduate; Certificate Earner; or "Achiever" (one who had completed at least one "Level B--Advanced Occupational" course as defined by SAM, but had received no formal award).

These procedures resulted in an original sample of 2,700, distributed as follows:

	ARC	CRC	SCC	District
Graduates	615	119	289	1,023
Certificate Earners	+ 91	+ 4	+132	+ 227
Total "Completers"	706	123	421	1,250
"Achievers"	661	372	417	1,450
Totals	1,367	495	838	2,700

Survey Instruments

The Tex-SIS Student Follow-Up questionnaires were selected after a careful review of a number of survey instruments identified through a search of ERIC documents. The review included an item-by-item analysis of the Tex-SIS forms as compared to the questionnaire previously used by colleges in the Los Rios District and those developed by NCHEMS, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. The Tex-SIS forms have been extensively field tested and are currently used throughout the state of Texas and elsewhere.

The Tex-SIS system includes a number of different questionnaires designed for various purposes. The forms selected for this study were:

1) The Tex-SIS GRAD-1 Form, used for both graduates and certificate earners (referred to as GRADs in this report); and

2) The Tex-SIS NRS Form, used for nonreturning "achievers" (NRSs).

Each questionnaire included four sections:

A. General Information (to be answered by all)
B. Employment Information (answer if employed)
C. Educational Information (answer if enrolled since leaving)
D. Future Plans (to be answered by all)

In addition, each questionnaire provided space for comments.

The questions regarding employment and its relationship to college work completed were worded precisely to conform to federal reporting requirements, and the forms were color-coded to differentiate GRAD from NRS questionnaires. Wording of the items was virtually identical except that a few items appeared on one form and not the other, according to the population being surveyed.

Copies of each form and a summary of the data elements are included in the Appendix of this report.

Survey Procedures

Each college handled the mailing of questionnaires to its own former students, and responses were returned to the same campus; however, a concerted effort was made to ensure that each college followed the same procedures. At a workshop attended by the Dean of Occupational Education from each college and his/her secretary, together with district office administrators and staff, the plan described below was developed and subsequently carried out.

Mailing lists/labels. District Data Processing identified the students to be surveyed, using the SAM guidelines previously described, and provided a list for each college in two formats: (1) an alpha list of all students to be surveyed; and (2) a list grouped by USOE code (assumed to be the student's major field of study). This code indicated the program identified with the "highest level" SAM course in which the student had been enrolled during 1981-82.

Although it was acknowledged that the students' majors (as indicated by USOE code, using the SAM guidelines) differ substantially each year from the actual degrees awarded, the decision was made to use the same list which had been used for the corresponding VEDS Fall Enrollment Report. A strong recommendation for future follow-up studies will be that a more accurate method of identifying student majors be followed.

District Data Processing also printed three sets of address labels, each containing (in addition to name and address), three items:

1) USOE Code
2) Completion Code (Graduate, Certificate Earner, or "Achiever")
3) SAM Class Level ("Advanced Occupational" or other level)

Two mailings were sent: the first, during the week of February 23, 1983, to all students on the lists; the second (including a second questionnaire), approximately two weeks later to all who had not yet responded. The third set of labels was printed in case additional follow-up was desired at a later date.

Cover letters. Separate cover letters were drafted for each mailing (see Appendix) and the colleges agreed to use identical letters, reproduced on their respective letterheads and bearing the signatures of their college president and occupational education dean.

Materials. Each packet required a cover letter; a questionnaire (GRAD or NRS); a Number 9 self-addressed, postpaid envelope for the return of the completed questionnaire; and a Number 10 envelope for mailing the set of materials to former students. Based on information from the ERIC review of similar studies and response rates in previous Los Rios follow-up surveys, it was decided to order materials for a second mailing numbering approximately 85% of the first. Envelopes had to be printed at each college bearing the specific wording required for first class handling.

Survey Responses

Responses from 1,219 students (663 GRAD, 556 NRS) had been received by April 7, the deadline set for mailing completed questionnaires to Tex-SIS for processing. Since a total of 206 items had been returned by the post office as undeliverable, this represented an adjusted response rate of 48.9% at that time. An additional 72 forms (33 GRAD; 39 NRS) were received later, resulting in final adjusted response rates as follows:

	ARC	CRC	SSC	District
GRAD Forms	61.4%	71.4%	60.3%	62.0%
NRS Forms	46.1%	38.5%	43.6%	43.4%
Overall Response Rate	53.9%	45.9%	51.7%	51.8%

The late responses will be hand-tabulated and compared with computer summaries for internal use. (A summary of response rates by college is included in the Appendix.)

Data Analysis

Computer printouts were generated for graduates and for nonreturning students by college and for the district as a whole in composite form as well as by gender, ethnicity, age, major, and "undefined" respondents.

The data were further analyzed using SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (1975).

Check for Non-Response Bias

A comparison of the demographic characteristics of survey respondents with those of the total district enrollment for Fall 1981 revealed that women, minorities, and alumni 24 years old or younger were underrepresented in the survey as compared to that group. Thus the results of this study cannot be considered representative of the total Los Rios District enrollment in 1981-82.

It should be noted that the population included in this survey was determined by VEDS reporting requirements and was not a random sample of the student body. No summary of demographic information is available for 1981-82 occupational students as a group, nor for those included in the initial mailing of this follow-up study. A recommendation for future surveys will be that such data be generated concurrently when preparing the master list and mailing labels.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A general limitation of this study is the fact that the students surveyed did not represent a random or stratified sample of the total occupational education students enrolled, nor of the general student population for 1981-82.

Two specific limitations of this study relate to the method used to determine the "major field" of the respondents, and to the number of replies received in each major field. Computer printouts are available showing responses to both questionnaires tabulated according to the major field of the respondent; however, these data must be examined in light of the limitations discussed below.

Method Used to Determine Major

The major attributed to the student was determined using the SAM Follow-Up Matrix recommended by the Community College Chancellor's Office (SAM Operations Manual, July 1981, pp. 13-24). This method employs the following steps:

1) Each college assigns a "SAM Priority Level" (A = Apprenticeship; B = Advanced Occupational; C = Clearly Occupational; D = Possibly Occupational) to each "occupational" course it offers.

2) Each such course is also assigned a USOE Voc-Ed Code number, indicating the occupational program of which it is a part.

3) For purposes of this study, each USOE number was matched with a major as described in the respective college catalogs.

4) Only courses completed during Fall 1981 or Spring 1982 were used to determine a student's "major" for this study. The computer program was designed to search the records for both semesters and to give priority to the "highest SAM level" course in assigning a student to a specific USOE group; if two courses were at the same level, the course completed most recently determined the major.

This procedure resulted in at least two types of problems: a student's name would not appear on the follow-up list if s/he (a) completed all required courses in the occupational major, and then took only general education courses during the last two semesters of attendance; and/or (b) completed degree or certificate requirements but then reenrolled for some additional course during the following semester.

Some of the problems inherent in the SAM system have been described in other recent studies (Sheldon, 1982; Brooks, 1982), but their effect on the validity of the data gathered in this survey (with respect to specific majors) can be illustrated by the following comparison of the Student Follow-Up list generated for American River College with degrees actually awarded by that college.

Of 809 AA Degrees granted by ARC in June 1982, 359 were awarded in majors considered occupational for VEDS reporting purposes. Of these, 117 (32.6%) did not appear at all on the computer-generated list for this study, and 34 (9.5%) who were on the list were "assigned" occupational majors different from the ones actually awarded. Thus, of the 359 occupational education degrees awarded at ARC in Spring 1982, only 208 (57.9%) were correctly identified by the SAM matrix. Furthermore, 153 students whose names were included in the computer list for this occupational education follow-up actually received their degrees in "general education" or other non-occupational majors. Although similar analyses were not made for CRC and SCC, there is no reason to believe that the results would be different at those colleges.

Discrepancies of this magnitude are particularly significant when analyzing former students' responses to questions requesting an evaluation of courses in their major field, relationship of courses taken in the major to later employment, and reasons why they might be working in a field outside their major. If respondents graduated in a major different from the one "assigned" to them by the SAM matrix, the responses may be both erroneous and misleading.

Number of Responses

The adjusted response rate to this survey was 51.8% district-wide (GRADs 62.0%, NRSs 43.4%), which is considered to be a good rate compared with similar studies. However, when the total responses are broken down by college and among 58 occupational majors, the number of responses related to a specific occupational program is often too small to be useful. Lists showing the response rates, by college and by major as defined for this study, are included in the Appendix.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

A total of 1,219 usable questionnaires (663 from graduates and 556 from nonreturning students) were received by the deadline for computer tabulation and comprise the basis for the percentages in the tables and discussion which follow. An additional 72 responses (33 GRAD, 39 NRS) were received later and will be compared with computer summaries for internal use. The overall adjusted response rate was 51.8% (GRADs, 62.0%; NRSs, 43.4%).

The total number of respondents by college and by category (GRAD or NRS) is indicated in the heading of Table 1, but the number of responses to each item will vary since not all questions were answered by all respondents. Computer printouts showing the number of responses to each item by gender, ethnicity, age, and major field were generated for each college and for the district as a whole, and the entire data file is available for analysis by SPSS.

Part 1: DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Tables 1, 2 and 3 provide information on the gender, ethnicity and age of the respondents to this study.

Distribution by Gender

District-wide, females comprised 51.3% of the responding graduates but only 45.3% of the nonreturning students who reported their gender (Table 1). Almost half (49.8%) of the NRSs and 40.7% of the GRADs were male, while 2.0% of GRADs and 4.9% of NRSs omitted this question. A comparison of individual college profiles reveals that at American River College (ARC), a majority of each group were male; at Sacramento City College (SCC) females predominated in both groups; and at Cosumnes River College (CRC) more female GRADs but more male NRSs responded.

Distribution by Ethnicity

Distinct profiles are also evident when responses from alumni of each college are compared on the basis of ethnicity (Table 2). In the district as a whole, 73.5% of the GRADs and 78.2% of NRSs were white, yet comparable percentages at the colleges ranged from 81.7%-85.9% white at ARC to 73.6%-74.8% at CRC and 58.2%-66.9% at SCC. Asians comprised the largest minority enrollment in the district, with Hispanics and blacks following in almost equal percentages; however, ethnic distributions varied greatly among the three colleges, perhaps reflecting the residential patterns of their respective service areas.

Table 1
DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER

CATEGORY	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD N=663	NRS N=556	GRAD N=383	NRS N=277	GRAD N=72	NRS N=131	GRAD N=208	NRS N=143
Male	46.7%	49.8%	50.4%	50.2%	43.1%	57.3%	41.4%	42.6%
Female	51.3%	45.3%	47.8%	44.0%	54.2%	38.9%	56.7%	53.4%
Undefined	2.0%	4.9%	1.8%	5.8%	2.8%	3.8%	1.9%	4.1%

Table 2
DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC GROUP	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.8%	2.7%	2.6%	2.9%	.0%	3.8%	1.0%	1.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8.9%	6.8%	5.2%	1.4%	13.9%	13.7%	13.9%	10.8%
Black/not Hispanic	5.9%	4.5%	5.0%	4.7%	4.2%	.8%	8.2%	7.4%
Hispanic	6.2%	4.5%	2.9%	2.2%	4.2%	4.6%	13.0%	8.8%
White/not Hispanic	73.5%	78.2%	81.7%	85.9%	73.6%	74.8%	58.2%	66.9%
Nonresident Alien	.8%	.2%	- -	- -	.0%	.8%	2.4%	- -
Undefined	3.0%	3.1%	2.6%	2.9%	4.2%	1.5%	3.4%	4.7%

Distribution by Age Groups

District-wide, almost 33% of respondents (GRADs, 40%; NRSs, 25%) were 24 years old or younger (Table 3), supporting the traditional focus of the community college as an institution where many young persons begin their postsecondary education. Approximately 20% of respondents were 25 to 29 years old, and almost 44% (37% of GRADs and nearly 52% of NRSs) reported their age as 30 or over.

Again, the differences among the three district colleges were noteworthy: alumni of CRC and SCC were considerably younger than those from ARC. Among GRADs, 55.6% from CRC and 43.7% from SCC were 24 or younger, while at ARC this group included only 38.9%. At ARC, almost 43% of the responding GRADs were over 30; at CRC and SCC, this group comprised only 26.3% and 29.4%, respectively. Almost 59% of NRSs from ARC were 30 or over; 48% from CRC and only 40.6% from SCC were in this age group.

The two subgroups studied also showed sharp contrasts with respect to age. District-wide, GRADs averaged 30.1 years of age and NRSs, 33.3 years. This age differential was consistent at all colleges, but was more pronounced at CRC and ARC (where NRSs averaged 4.3 and 4.1 years older, respectively). At SCC the two groups were closer in average age: GRADS, 29.1 years; NRSs, 30.5 years. These differences may have a significant relationship to the respondents' employment status, primary objective in attending college, and salaries as reported in this study.

Major Fields of Study

Survey results were also summarized on the basis of the respondent's major field of study, as identified by the SAM matrix previously described. Printouts were generated for GRADSs and NRSs by college in some 58 majors, for a total of 127 separate reports (21 majors are offered at more than one college; some majors had no respondents to the survey). A list of the majors and the number of responses for each is included in the Appendix of this report.

The printouts by major, as well as the actual questionnaires, are retained in the office of the Dean of Occupational Education at each college. The limitations previously discussed with respect to possible error in identifying the major can be overcome through a visual inspection of the questionnaires: the first item asks respondents to indicate their major. It seems reasonable to assume that responses to the survey were made with this major in mind; however, the major code keyed into the computer for this study was the one which corresponds to the USOE code shown on the mailing label. Any discrepancy between the two should be kept in mind when analyzing the data by major field.

District summaries by major were also generated; however, these are of limited validity since programs which used the same Tex-SIS major code number are often quite different from college to college and cannot legitimately be grouped together for reporting purposes.

Table 3
DISTRIBUTION BY AGE GROUP

AGE GROUP	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
16-19	.6%	2.7%	- -	3.3%	1.4%	3.1%	1.4%	1.4%
20-24	38.9%	21.9%	34.2%	15.2%	54.2%	26.7%	42.3%	30.4%
25-29	20.1%	18.5%	20.4%	16.3%	13.9%	19.1%	21.6%	22.3%
30-34	12.4%	18.7%	15.4%	21.3%	6.9%	16.0%	8.7%	16.2%
35-44	13.9%	16.0%	15.7%	16.6%	9.7%	16.8%	12.0%	14.2%
45-54	7.8%	11.7%	9.4%	14.1%	6.9%	9.9%	5.3%	8.8%
55-64	2.6%	4.5%	2.4%	6.5%	2.8%	3.8%	2.9%	1.4%
65 and over	.2%	.7%	- -	.7%	- -	1.5%	.5%	- -
Undefined	3.6%	5.2%	2.6%	6.1%	4.2%	3.1%	5.3%	5.4%
MODAL AGE GROUP	20-24	20-24	20-24	30-34	20-24	20-24	20-24	20-24
AVERAGE AGE	30.1	33.3	31.0	35.1	28.2	32.5	29.1	30.5

16

Primary Objective in Attending Our Two-Year College

The first question on each form (following demographic items) asked "What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our college?" As shown in Table 4, the large majority of respondents had a job-related objective, with 57.9% of the GRADs and 64.2% of non-returning students indicating their desire to "improve job skills" or "prepare for a job to be obtained." Again, there are appreciable differences among the colleges: at SCC, both GRADs and NRSs were primarily preparing for jobs to be obtained; at ARC, the responses of GRADs are similar to SCC's but the NRSs are almost equally divided between job preparation and improvement of job skills; while at CRC the smaller number of respondents indicating an interest in improving job skills (8.6%) reflects the younger age of this student body as shown previously in Table 3.

Since the target group for this study comprised students identified by their enrollment in occupational education courses, these figures are not surprising. Perhaps more unexpected is the fact that 30.1% of GRAD respondents district-wide had "university transfer credit" as their primary goal; at CRC, this was the goal of almost 40%. The relationship of these data to current employment and educational status is discussed below.

"Personal interest" was the primary goal expressed by 16.4% of the NRSs and 9.4% of GRADs who responded to the survey. While there were some differences among the colleges on this item, the range was not great.

Current Educational/Employment Status

Table 5 shows the current educational and employment status of respondents to the survey. District-wide, approximately three-quarters of all respondents (GRADs 73.1%, NRSs 78.6%) were employed at the time of this survey. Almost 40% of GRADs and more than 30% of NRSs indicated they were currently enrolled in college; at CRC, these percentages were higher: 40.8% for NRSs and 45.8% for GRADs, reflecting the goals and relative youth of students who attended that college. A comparison of the responses on these two items reveals that many of the respondents who were enrolled in college were also employed, at least part-time (those currently attending and those employed total more than 100%).

The district percentages of those who were "unemployed and actively seeking" (GRADs, 9.5%; NRSs 9.0%) compare favorably with the 11.8% unemployment rate reported in March 1983 for the Sacramento area as a whole; however, the percentages for CRC GRADs (16.7%) and for SCC non-returning students (13.8%) are not encouraging.

Completion of Educational Objective

Nonreturning students were asked to indicate the extent to which their primary objective had been completed, whether they planned to

Table 4
PRIMARY OBJECTIVE IN ATTENDING OUR TWO-YEAR COLLEGE
Item A-1

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Improve job skills	16.6%	27.5%	17.9%	35.4%	8.6%	23.5%	17.0%	16.7%
Prepare for job to be obtained	41.3%	36.7%	41.7%	33.4%	34.6%	30.7%	42.7%	48.2%
University transfer credit	30.1%	16.2%	29.7%	12.3%	39.5%	19.0%	27.8%	20.8%
Personal interest	9.4%	16.4%	9.1%	15.6%	13.6%	22.9%	8.7%	11.9%
Other	2.5%	3.2%	1.6%	3.3%	3.7%	3.9%	3.7%	2.4%

Table 5
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL/EMPLOYMENT STATUS
Items GRAD A-2, A-3 (NRS A-9, A-10)

EDUCATIONAL STATUS	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Currently Attending School	39.8%	30.5%	37.6%	25.0%	45.8%	40.8%	41.8%	31.7%
Not Currently Attending	60.2%	69.5%	62.4%	75.0%	54.2%	59.2%	58.3%	68.3%

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Employed (except military)	72.5%	78.2%	75.7%	78.6%	66.7%	79.5%	68.5%	76.6%
Employed (full-time military)	.6%	.4%	.5%	.4%	1.4%	.8%	.5%	- -
Unemployed, Actively Seeking	9.5%	9.0%	8.1%	6.2%	16.7%	9.5%	9.7%	13.8%
Not in Labor Force, Not Seeking	17.4%	12.4%	15.7%	14.9%	15.3%	10.2%	21.4%	9.7%

pursue this objective further (and if so, where), and the amount of education required to accomplish their objective. Responses are shown on Tables 6 and 7.

Although these students did not graduate, 34% of respondents to the survey indicated that their objective had been fully completed. More than 43% had enrolled only for selected courses, and only 3?% indicated that an AA degree had been their goal. Of those planning to pursue their educational objective in the future, 53.1% said they would return to the same college to do so. These questions were omitted from the GRAD form, since graduates were assumed to have met their community college goal.

Principal Reason for Not Reenrolling and Feeling About Educational Experience

Nonreturning students were also asked their principal reason for not reenrolling (Table 8) and how they felt about their educational experience as a whole (Table 9). More than one-fourth (27.8%) of the respondents indicated they had completed the courses they needed. Of other reasons cited, most were not college-related: conflicting job hours (14.8%); related employment (7.1%); change of residence (4.4%); personal problems (8.6%). Financial reasons were cited by only 6.1% of NRSs district-wide. While 9.1% checked transfer to another college as their reason, the percentage varied from 6.4% at ARC to 14.0% at CRC.

"Dissatisfaction with instruction or course content" and "problems with grades" were cited by a total of only 5.6% of all respondents. Furthermore, 82.9% reported they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their educational experience, and all colleges averaged well above 4.1% on a 5-point scale where 5 represented the highest measure of satisfaction (Table 9). These items were not included on the GRAD form.

Ratings of Major Programs of Study and College Services

Both GRADs and NRSs were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, various aspects of their academic programs and the college services they had utilized. The results of these ratings are shown on Table 10.

Overall, former students gave high marks to the characteristics and services identified. As in previous surveys (Renkiewicz and others, 1982; Rasor, 1982), students rated "instructor interest" and "quality of instruction" consistently high (average scores 4.12 to 4.19 on a scale where 5 was the highest score). College services were also ranked considerably above average, with library services and veterans services receiving particularly high ratings.

The question on courses completed stated that it referred only to courses taken in the respondent's major field. However, due to the problems previously discussed with respect to identifying the major, these ratings should be considered more relevant to college courses in general than to specific programs of study.

Table 6
EXTENT TO WHICH OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN COMPLETED/PLAN TO PURSUE OBJECTIVE FURTHER
Items NRS A-2 and NRS A-3 (Not on GRAD Form)

EXTENT COMPLETED	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Fully Completed	- -	34.0%	- -	30.6%	- -	31.3%	- -	43.1%
Partially Completed	- -	55.9%	- -	58.6%	- -	59.4%	- -	47.9%
Not Completed	- -	10.1%	- -	10.9%	- -	9.4%	- -	9.0%

PURSUE FURTHER?	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
No	- -	25.8%	- -	22.6%	- -	27.8%	- -	30.3%
Yes	- -	74.2%	- -	77.4%	- -	72.2%	- -	69.7%
If Yes, where?								
At Our College	- -	53.1%	- -	56.0%	- -	53.3%	- -	46.6%
At Another College	- -	34.5%	- -	30.6%	- -	35.6%	- -	41.8%
Other	- -	12.5%	- -	13.4%	- -	11.1%	- -	11.7%

Table 7
EDUCATION REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVE
Item NRS A-4 (Not on GRAD Form)

EDUCATION REQUIRED	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Selected Course(s)	- -	43.3%	- -	40.6%	- -	53.7%	- -	39.4%
Certificate Program	- -	19.8%	- -	20.6%	- -	16.9%	- -	20.7%
Two-Year Associate Degree	- -	32.1%	- -	33.6%	- -	25.0%	- -	36.8%
Other	- -	4.8%	- -	5.8%	- -	4.4%	- -	3.2%

Table 8
PRINCIPAL REASON FOR NOT REENROLLING AT OUR COLLEGE THIS SEMESTER
Item NRS A-5 (Not on GRAD Form)

REASON FOR NOT REENROLLING	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Completed Needed Courses	- -	27.8%	- -	27.3%	- -	18.7%	- -	36.4%
Transportation Problems	- -	2.4%	- -	2.3%	- -	4.0%	- -	1.1%
Transferred to Another College	- -	9.1%	- -	6.4%	- -	14.0%	- -	9.7%
Found Job in Related Occupation	- -	7.1%	- -	5.8%	- -	4.7%	- -	11.4%
Conflicting Job Hours	- -	14.8%	- -	15.8%	- -	14.7%	- -	13.1%
Financial Reasons	- -	6.1%	- -	7.1%	- -	3.3%	- -	6.8%
Change of Residence	- -	4.4%	- -	3.9%	- -	5.3%	- -	4.6%
Grade Problems	- -	.5%	- -	.6%	- -	- -	- -	.6%
Dissatisfied with Instruction	- -	3.1%	- -	3.2%	- -	4.0%	- -	2.3%
Dissatisfied with Course Content	- -	2.0%	- -	1.9%	- -	3.3%	- -	1.1%
Personal/Family Illness or Injury	- -	2.5%	- -	2.6%	- -	1.3%	- -	3.4%
Other Personal/Family Reasons	- -	6.1%	- -	8.7%	- -	4.7%	- -	2.8%
Other	- -	14.1%	- -	14.5%	- -	22.0%	- -	6.8%

Table 9
FEELING ABOUT COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE
Item NRS A-6 (Not on GRAD Form)
Scores: 5 = Very Satisfied; 4 = Satisfied; 3 = Average; 2 = Disappointed; 1 = Very Disappointed

FEELING ABOUT EDUCATION	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Very Satisfied	- -	38.3%	- -	39.3%	- -	33.9%	- -	40.3%
Satisfied	- -	44.6%	- -	44.4%	- -	46.9%	- -	43.1%
Average	- -	14.0%	- -	12.0%	- -	17.7%	- -	14.6%
Disappointed	- -	2.7%	- -	3.6%	- -	1.5%	- -	2.1%
Very Disappointed	- -	.4%	- -	.7%	- -	.0%	- -	.0%
AVERAGE RATING	- -	4.18	- -	4.18	- -	4.13	- -	4.22

Table 10

RATINGS OF COURSES IN MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY AND COLLEGE SERVICES

Items GRAD A-4 and A-5 (NRS A-7, A-8)

Average Scores: 5 = Very Good; 4 = Good; 3 = Average; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor

COURSE CHARACTERISTIC	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Quality of Instruction	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.10	4.06	4.12	4.20	4.15
Grading/Testing	3.83	3.88	3.82	3.90	3.69	3.88	3.90	3.86
Instructor Interest	4.19	4.16	4.18	4.15	4.34	4.17	4.16	4.17
Content of Course(s)	4.03	3.98	4.04	4.00	3.96	3.93	4.03	3.97
Instructional Media	3.73	3.69	3.70	3.70	3.79	3.71	3.77	3.65
Class Size	3.67	3.76	3.58	3.76	4.07	3.89	3.72	3.66

SERVICE	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Financial aids	3.77	3.80	3.71	3.78	4.20	3.90	3.73	3.78
Counseling	3.60	3.55	3.53	3.52	3.73	3.81	3.68	3.40
Job Placement Services	3.40	3.19	3.34	3.33	3.65	3.88	3.41	2.67
Course Advisement	3.51	3.56	3.49	3.58	3.65	3.86	3.48	3.36
Tutoring Services	3.73	3.85	3.67	3.83	4.00	4.33	3.76	3.54
Veterans Services	4.06	3.94	4.16	4.20	3.91	4.42	3.85	3.30
Learning Lab/Packages	3.84	3.77	3.70	3.71	4.00	4.00	3.92	3.65
Student Activities	3.65	3.64	3.65	3.89	3.63	3.29	3.65	3.27
Library Services	4.16	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.35	4.13	4.03	3.97

Part 2: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

The primary purpose of this survey was to gather information about the current employment status of former Los Rios students, and the responses provided ample data on this subject. As reported previously (Table 5, page 18), 73.1% of the graduates and 78.6% of nonreturning students reported that they were employed or in full-time military service at the time of this survey. Those persons were asked to complete the section of the questionnaire dealing with employment, and their responses are shown on Tables 11 through 19 which follow.

The interrelationships among the various questions regarding employment are important and complex, requiring an examination of several tables simultaneously if useful conclusions are to be drawn. Again, the relatively low correlation between the respondents' "major field" as defined in this study and the degrees actually earned must be kept in mind as these data are analyzed.

Employer Information

The first item in the employment section requested the name and address of the respondent's employer, as well as the job title and job duties of the person completing the questionnaire. Respondents were also asked to provide the name and title of their immediate supervisor so that the opportunity could be provided for that person to participate in future surveys made by the college to evaluate courses and programs offered. Although this information was not keyed for computer analysis, it is available through inspection of the individual questionnaires which were returned to each college.

Relationship of Job to Courses Completed

Almost 70% of respondents district-wide reported that their current job was related to the college courses they completed (Table 11). The percentage responding positively to this item was highest at ARC (GRADs 72%; NRSs 75%) and lowest at CRC (60% and 59%).

Reasons for Employment Outside Area of Preparation

Graduates employed in an area not related to courses completed were asked the reason they were in another field, and their responses are shown in Table 12. This item was omitted from the NRS form.

"Transfer to a four-year college" was the reason cited by more than 40% of those responding, illustrating again the fact that the sample of former students included in this follow-up survey cannot be considered exclusively "occupational." Almost 20% reported they were unable to find employment in their field, and approximately 10% felt they were not qualified for work in an area related to courses they had completed.

Table 11
IS JOB RELATED TO COURSES COMPLETED AT OUR COLLEGE?
Item GRAD C-2 (NRS B-2)

RELATIONSHIP	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Yes; Directly or Closely Related	69.6%	69.1%	72.0%	75.1%	60.0%	59.0%	67.9%	66.7%
No; Remotely/Not at All Related	30.4%	30.9%	28.0%	24.9%	40.0%	41.1%	32.1%	33.3%

Table 12
IF NOT EMPLOYED IN OCCUPATIONAL AREA RELATED TO COURSES COMPLETED, WHY NOT?
Item GRAD D-1 (Not on NRS Form)

REASON	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Transferred to Four-Year College	40.6%	- -	41.6%	- -	30.4%	- -	39.6%	- -
Not Qualified for Job in Field	9.5%	- -	9.7%	- -	12.1%	- -	8.3%	- -
Preferred Work in Another Field	8.5%	- -	11.7%	- -	3.0%	- -	5.2%	- -
Better Paying Job, Another Field	7.1%	- -	5.8%	- -	15.2%	- -	6.3%	- -
Could Not Find Job in Field	19.4%	- -	15.6%	- -	18.2%	- -	26.0%	- -
Worked in Major Field but Changed	3.9%	- -	3.9%	- -	.0%	- -	5.2%	- -
Other	11.0%	- -	11.7%	- -	12.1%	- -	9.4%	- -

Table 13
EMPLOYED IN YOUR OCCUPATIONAL AREA PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT AT OUR COLLEGE?
Item GRAD C-8 (NRS B-9)

PRIOR EMPLOYMENT	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Yes	42.2%	65.4%	44.7%	68.0%	37.5%	68.7%	38.6%	57.4%
No	57.9%	34.6%	55.3%	32.0%	62.5%	31.3%	61.4%	42.6%

The percentages of respondents preferring work in another field (8.5%) and those who found a better paying job in another field (7.1%) are fairly similar district-wide, but at ARC respondents seem to have gone into another field because of preference, while at CRC the change was reportedly because of higher pay; at SCC responses to these two options differed only slightly.

Prior Employment in Occupational Area

As shown in Table 13, the number of respondents employed in their occupational area prior to enrolling at a Los Rios college exceeded 42% for graduates and 65% for nonreturning students. These figures are of particular importance when considering the salaries reported by these same groups, as discussed below.

Current Salary

In almost all instances, salaries reported by NRSs are higher than those reported by GRADs (Table 14); however, these data are not surprising when other factors are also considered: NRSs averaged slightly more than three years older than GRADs (Table 3, page 16); they were more likely to have been employed in their field prior to enrolling in college (Table 13, p. 24) and generally sought to upgrade skills rather than to prepare for a new job (Table 4, page 18). In addition, they were more likely to be working full time (Table 15, p. 26).

Since salary information for VEDS reporting must be very specific, the questionnaires were constructed to allow respondents to report their salaries according to their actual pay period (hour, week, month, year). To provide a common basis for comparison purposes, salaries were converted to monthly equivalents and averages were computed for all full-time employment and for all employment (full- and part-time combined).

Hours of Employment Per Week

VEDS reporting also requires specific information regarding the number of respondents employed full-time (defined as 35 or more hours per week). As shown in Table 15, almost 71% of employed GRADs and 82% of NRSs district-wide were working full-time at the time of this survey. A comparison of the data from the three colleges reveals that percentages of NRSs in this category were fairly similar (ranging from 85% to 78%), but responses from graduates showed marked contrasts: 78% from ARC but only approximately 56% from CRC and 61% from SCC were working full time. A relationship may exist between these figures and those reported in Table 5 (p. 18) with respect to educational status: only approximately 38% of ARC graduates but almost 46% from CRC and 42% from SCC reported they were currently attending school.

While the information reported above is interesting and provides the basis for possible future analysis, no relationship is implied

Table 14
CURRENT SALARY (GROSS, WITHOUT OVERTIME)
Item GRAD C-3 (NRS B-3)

PAY PERIOD	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Per Hour	$ 7.72	$ 7.90	$ 7.73	$ 8.25	$ 5.31	$ 6.42	$ 8.47	$ 8.47
Per Week	266	270	298	286	130	258	260	270
Per Month	1,321	1,512	1,384	1,671	1,059	1,415	1,258	1,287
Per Year	19,226	22,788	20,274	23,364	15,626	20,314	15,363	22,556
AVERAGE PER MONTH								
All Full-time	$ 1,545	$ 1,647	$ 1,569	$ 1,833	$ 1,155	$ 1,419	$ 1,613	1,472
All (FT and PT)	1,272	1,472	1,363	1,641	838	1,274	1,242	1,326

Table 15
HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT PER WEEK
Item GRAD C-4 (NRS B-4)

HOURS PER WEEK	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Less than 35	29.5%	18.0%	22.0%	15.3%	43.9%	19.3%	39.5%	22.0%
35-39	3.9%	5.4%	4.3%	5.1%	.0%	4.8%	4.4%	6.6%
40	59.2%	58.6%	62.9%	47.2%	51.2%	72.3%	54.4%	68.1%
Over 40	7.5%	18.0%	10.8%	32.4%	4.9%	3.6%	1.8%	3.3%
AVERAGE WEEKLY HOURS	35.6	39.5	37.9	42.4	31.5	37.0	32.6	36.3

between the salaries summarized in Table 14 and the number of hours of employment per week shown in Table 15, since no match of individual responses to the two questions has been made.

Usefulness of Training in Performance of Job

When asked to evaluate the training provided by the college as to its usefulness in on-the-job performance (Table 16), respondents gave high marks to all the colleges. More than 70% of the GRADs and 68% of the NRSs rated their training good or very good, and ratings at each college averaged 3.8 or above on a five-point scale (5 = Very Good).

Help Provided by Courses in Occupational Area

In addition to giving high ratings as to the usefulness of their training, respondents reported that courses in their occupational area had helped them in specific ways (Table 17). Almost 52% of GRADs and 56% of NRSs indicated they had been helped to perform or advance in their present jobs. In addition, 20% of NRSs and 30% of GRADs were helped to obtain jobs through courses completed at their college. The responses for SCC with respect to acquiring new jobs (GRADs, 33%; NRSs, 30%) are particularly significant since this was the primary objective of 42% to 48% of SCC alumni responding to this survey (Table 4, p. 18).

Recommendations to Others Similarly Employed

Nonreturning students, when asked whether they would recommend the courses they had taken to others employed in similar positions, replied overwhelmingly in the affirmative (Table 18). More than 76% indicated they would do so, 13.5% were undecided, and only about 10% did not care to make such a recommendation. This item was not included on the GRAD form.

Rating of Job Availability in Occupational Area

When graduates were asked about the availability of jobs in their occupational area (Table 19), more than 35% rated the prospects good or very good, and another 35% reported average availability. Only about 7% rated the prospects as very poor. Ratings by respondents from all three colleges were very similar.

The limitations previously described regarding the identification of program majors and the number of responses for each are particularly relevant in any analysis of this item, and thus few generalizations can be made at this time; however, this might be a worthwhile subject for further data analysis using SPSS. This item was omitted from the NRS form.

Table 16

RATE TRAINING RECEIVED AT OUR COLLEGE AS TO ITS USEFULNESS IN PERFORMANCE OF YOUR JOB

Item GRAD C-6 (NRS B-7)

Scores: 5 = Very Good; 4 = Good; 3 = Average; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor

RATING	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Very Good	29.1%	25.5%	28.0%	26.4%	21.3%	19.3%	33.8%	29.0%
Good	41.0%	42.5%	40.0%	40.9%	51.1%	46.6%	39.6%	42.0%
Average	26.3%	24.7%	29.1%	23.3%	25.5%	28.4%	20.9%	24.0%
Poor	2.0%	5.0%	2.2%	5.7%	.0%	5.7%	2.2%	3.0%
Very Poor	1.7%	2.4%	.7%	3.6%	2.1%	.0%	3.6%	2.0%
AVERAGE SCORE	3.94	3.84	3.92	3.81	3.89	3.80	3.98	3.93

Table 17

DID COURSES IN YOUR OCCUPATIONAL AREA HELP IN ANY OF THESE WAYS?

Item GRAD C-7 (NRS B-6)

HELP RECEIVED	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Helped to Obtain Job	30.6%	20.0%	30.1%	18.2%	25.0%	13.0%	33.0%	30.0%
Helped Perform on Present Job	34.8%	37.0%	34.3%	38.5%	39.1%	36.6%	34.4%	34.3%
Helped Advance on Present Job	17.0%	18.9%	18.0%	21.7%	14.1%	22.0%	16.1%	10.7%
None of the Above	13.0%	18.8%	11.9%	15.7%	17.2%	24.4%	13.9%	20.0%
Other	4.6%	5.3%	5.7%	5.9%	4.7%	4.1%	2.6%	5.0%

Table 18
RECOMMEND COURSE(S) TAKEN AT OUR COLLEGE TO OTHERS
EMPLOYED IN POSITIONS SIMILAR TO YOURS?
Item NRS B-8 (Not on GRAD Form)

RECOMMEND COURSES	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Yes	- -	76.4%	- -	79.2%	- -	72.6%	- -	74.5%
No	- -	10.2%	- -	9.6%	- -	9.5%	- -	11.8%
Undecided	- -	13.5%	- -	11.2%	- -	17.9%	- -	13.7%

Table 19
RATE AVAILABILITY OF JOBS IN YOUR OCCUPATIONAL AREA
Item GRAD C-9 (Not on NRS Form)
Scores: 5 = Very Good; 4 = Good; 3 = Average; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor

AVAILABILITY OF JOBS	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Very Good	11.8%	- -	13.0%	- -	12.5%	- -	9.1%	- -
Good	24.0%	- -	23.6%	- -	20.8%	- -	25.9%	- -
Average	35.0%	- -	31.0%	- -	37.5%	- -	42.0%	- -
Poor	22.5%	- -	24.7%	- -	25.0%	- -	17.5%	- -
Very Poor	6.7%	- -	7.8%	- -	4.2%	- -	5.6%	- -
AVERAGE SCORE	3.12	- -	3.10	- -	3.13	- -	3.15	- -

Part 3: EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

As reported in Table 5 (p. 18), 39.8% of responding GRADs and 30.5% of NRSs reported they were enrolled in college at the time of this survey. Those persons, and all others who had attended another college since leaving the college conducting the survey, were asked to complete the section of the questionnaire dealing with educational information, and the results are reported in Tables 20 through 24 which follow.

College Information

Respondents were asked to provide the name and address of their current (or most recently attended) college, and to indicate their major field of study. This information was not included in the computer summaries; however, analysis of the data using SPSS revealed that 67.4% of the transferring GRADs and 33.5% of the NRSs had moved to a California State University campus. A substantial number were attending a Los Rios college (21.3% of GRADs and 42.9% of NRSs); only 2.4% of the graduates and 5.6% of NRSs had transferred to the University of California system. Specific transfer data are shown in Table 20 below.

Table 20
TRANSFER COLLEGES

TRANSFER COLLEGE	ARC		CRC		SCC		Totals		% of
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	Total
American River	19	10	4	3	9	6	32	19	11.3
Cosumnes River	3	2	3	12	1	7	7	21	6.2
Sacramento City	3	3	8	15	12	11	23	29	11.5
Other CCC	10	9	0	1	3	2	13	12	5.5
CSU System	108	24	22	10	66	20	196	54	55.3
UC System	2	2	2	4	3	3	7	9	3.5
CA Independent	6	6	0	1	0	0	6	7	2.9
Out-of-State	3	5	0	1	0	1	3	7	2.2
Foreign College	1	2	0	0	3	1	4	3	1.6
Totals	155	63	39	47	97	51	291	161	100.0

Problems in Transferring

Even though the majority of students included in this survey had been enrolled primarily in courses and/or majors which were defined as "occupational" and thus were not intended for university transfer, an overwhelming percentage of respondents who did transfer (GRADs, 87.2%; NRSs, 91.9%) reported no problems in making the transition (Table 21). Those who experienced some difficulty were asked to identify the types of problems they encountered; the actual numbers of responses to this portion of the question (37 GRADs and 14 NRSs) are also shown because the numbers are so small as to make the derived percentages somewhat misleading.

Credit Hours (Units) Transferred

Although only 12.8% of responding GRADs and 8.1% of NRSs district-wide had reported any problems when transferring to another college (Table 21 above), 62.8% of the GRADs and 35.1% of the NRSs indicated they had "lost" at least some credit hours (units) in the transfer (Table 22). Since relatively few occupational courses are offered at the baccalaureate level, the "loss" of some units is not surprising, and the fact that respondents did not perceive this as a problem seems to indicate that they had a good understanding of the nature of the courses they took and their relationship to university-level programs.

College Status and Classification

Of respondents enrolled in college at the time of this survey, 67.8% of GRADs and 48.7% of NRSs were attending full-time (Table 23). In the item on class standing the GRAD form provided only the options of Junior, Senior, Graduate Student and Other, presumably in the assumption that graduates would have at least junior standing. However, since many units earned in an occupational major might not have been transferable, it can be speculated that the 7.8% who responded "Other" might be at the freshman or sophomore level. Of the NRSs responding to this item, 26.3% had transferred before attaining junior status.

It is also interesting to note that 8.2% of responding GRADs and 17.2% of NRSs reported their status as graduate student. Since these students had been enrolled at a Los Rios college during 1981-82 and were responding to this survey in Spring 1983, it is obvious that many of them had completed more than the traditional 60 units before leaving the Los Rios District.

Credit Hours (Units) Completed

Nonreturning students were asked how many credit hours (units) they had completed at the college sending the survey form, and the results are shown in Table 24. District-wide, 53.9% of the respondents reported completing 30 or fewer units; 19.3% had earned between 31 and 60

Table 21
PROBLEMS TRANSFERRING TO ANOTHER COLLEGE?
(If Yes, Indicate Type of Problem)
Item GRAD B-2 (NRS C-2)

TRANSFER PROBLEM?	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
No Problem	87.2%	91.9%	86.5%	94.4%	86.8%	91.1%	88.4%	89.1%
Yes, Some Problem	12.8%	8.1%	13.5%	5.6%	13.2%	8.9%	11.6%	10.9%
Number of "Yes" Responses	N=37	N=16	N=21	N=5	N=5	N=4	N=11	N=7
TYPE OF PROBLEM	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Transferring Credit Hours	39.6%	25.0%	41.4%	20.0%	66.7%	75.0%	23.1%	.0%
Transcript Problems	31.3%	43.8%	24.1%	40.0%	33.3%	.0%	46.2%	71.4%
Admission Problems	8.3%	12.5%	10.3%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	7.7%	14.3%
Other	20.8%	18.8%	24.1%	40.0%	.0%	.0%	23.1%	14.3%

Table 22
CREDIT HOURS (UNITS) EARNED AT OUR COLLEGE, NOT ACCEPTED AT TRANSFER COLLEGE
Item GRAD B-3 (NRS C-3)

CREDIT HOURS ACCEPTED/LOST	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
All Credit Hours Accepted	37.2%	64.9%	31.5%	63.5%	40.0%	58.8%	45.2%	71.1%
Lost 1-3 Credit Hours	11.6%	11.5%	15.4%	7.7%	8.6%	14.7%	6.5%	13.3%
Lost 4-6 Credit Hours	15.9%	9.2%	20.8%	11.5%	11.4%	14.7%	9.7%	2.2%
Lost 7-12 Credit Hours	14.1%	6.1%	13.4%	5.8%	14.3%	8.8%	15.1%	4.4%
Lost 13-21 Credit Hours	9.4%	1.5%	8.1%	1.9%	17.1%	.0%	8.6%	2.2%
Lost more than 21 credit hours	11.9%	6.9%	10.7%	9.6%	8.6%	2.9%	15.1%	6.7%

Table 23
CURRENT STATUS/CLASSIFICATION AT PRESENT COLLEGE
Item GRAD B-4 (NRS C-5)

STATUS	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Part-time (Less than 12 units)	32.2%	51.3%	34.1%	46.5%	27.3%	45.2%	31.3%	60.5%
Full-time (12 or more units)	67.8%	48.7%	65.9%	53.5%	72.7%	54.8%	68.8%	39.5%
CLASSIFICATION	**GRAD**	**NRS**	**GRAD**	**NRS**	**GRAD**	**NRS**	**GRAD**	**NRS**
Freshman	- -	10.1%	- -	11.1%	- -	8.0%	- -	10.5%
Sophomore	- -	16.2%	- -	16.7%	- -	28.0%	- -	7.9%
Junior	68.1%	37.4%	67.7%	22.2%	69.0%	52.0%	68.5%	42.1%
Senior	16.0%	19.2%	17.7%	25.0%	10.3%	8.0%	15.1%	21.1%
Graduate Student	8.2%	17.2%	7.7%	25.0%	10.3%	4.0%	8.2%	18.4%
Other	7.8%	- -	6.9%	- -	10.3%	- -	8.2%	- -

Table 24
CREDIT HOURS (UNITS) COMPLETED AT OUR COLLEGE
Item NRS D-1 (Not on GRAD Form)

CREDIT HOURS (UNITS)	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
None	- -	.4%	- -	.4%	- -	.0%	- -	.8%
1-10	- -	20.2%	- -	19.1%	- -	29.5%	- -	14.3%
11-20	- -	21.7%	- -	19.6%	- -	21.9%	- -	25.4%
21-30	- -	11.6%	- -	12.0%	- -	18.1%	- -	5.6%
31-40	- -	7.0%	- -	9.3%	- -	8.6%	- -	1.6%
41-50	- -	4.6%	- -	3.6%	- -	4.8%	- -	6.4%
51-60	- -	7.7%	- -	6.2%	- -	7.6%	- -	10.3%
More than 60	- -	26.8%	- -	29.8%	- -	9.5%	- -	35.7%

units; and 26.8% had completed 60 or more units, even though they had not graduated. Among the three colleges, the percentages reporting completion of 31-60 units were quite similar, but there were sharp contrasts in other areas: 35.7% of SCC alumni but only 9.5% from CRC had completed more than 60 units; ARC's percentage in this category was 29.8%.

It should be noted that this question specified units completed "at our college," and thus the data do not necessarily reflect total units completed by the respondents. This item was not included on the GRAD form.

The Tex-SIS questionnaires also asked nonreturning students to indicate the number of "clock hours" they had completed. However, since college work completed is not usually summarized on the basis of clock hours in the Los Rios District, responses to this item were ignored in the preparation of this report, and this item will be omitted from future surveys.

Rating of Preparation for Continuing Education

Previous questions had asked respondents to evaluate the occupational training they received (Tables 16 and 17, p. 28). Table 25 shows their evaluation of the courses they completed in terms of preparation for continuing their education. More than 70% of all respondents considered their education at a Los Rios college to be either excellent or satisfactory, and only about 5.5% rated their preparation fair or inadequate for continuing their education. Again, it should be remembered that occupational courses are designed to prepare students for entry into employment, rather than for higher education.

The interrelationships among the various items regarding continued education will be analyzed further with SPSS as time permits.

Part 4: FUTURE PLANS

All respondents were asked to complete the last section of the survey, which elicited information on the former students' future plans and general recommendations regarding college courses and programs. The results are shown on Tables 26 and 27 which follow.

Relationship of Courses Taken to Career Plans

When asked "How do you see the course(s) completed at our college in terms of your career plans?" (Table 26), more than 82% of responding GRADs and almost 79% of NRSs indicated that the courses would be of direct benefit, either immediately or in the long term, and another 16% to 18% felt they would be of indirect benefit. Responses were relatively similar at all three colleges.

Table 25

HOW WELL DID COURSES COMPLETED AT OUR COLLEGE PREPARE YOU FOR CONTINUING YOUR EDUCATION?

Item GRAD B-5 (NRS C-4)

Scores: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Satisfactory; 3 = Good; 2 = Fair; 1 = Inadequate

EVALUATION OF PREPARATION	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
My Preparation Was Excellent	30.9%	24.7%	30.5%	31.0%	41.0%	18.2%	27.8%	22.0%
My Preparation Was Satisfactory	42.6%	46.0%	46.3%	43.7%	38.5%	45.5%	38.0%	49.2%
Good in Some Areas Only	21.0%	23.6%	19.2%	21.1%	12.8%	29.6%	26.9%	22.0%
Fair; All Could Have Been Better	4.0%	5.2%	2.3%	4.2%	7.7%	4.6%	5.6%	6.8%
My Preparation Was Inadequate	1.5%	.6%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	1.9%	.0%
AVERAGE SCORE	3.97	3.89	4.02	4.01	4.13	3.73	3.84	3.86

Table 26

WERE COURSE(S) COMPLETED AT OUR COLLEGE BENEFICIAL TO YOUR CAREER PLANS?

Item D-2

DEGREE OF BENEFIT	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Of Immediate, Direct Benefit	38.9%	34.2%	42.0%	36.2%	26.9%	36.7%	36.9%	28.2%
Of Long Term, Direct Benefit	43.3%	44.6%	41.3%	44.3%	52.2%	39.1%	44.4%	50.0%
Of Indirect Benefit	16.5%	18.3%	15.5%	17.0%	19.4%	19.5%	17.3%	19.7%
Of No Benefit	1.3%	3.0%	1.3%	2.6%	1.5%	4.7%	1.4%	2.1%

Table 27

INTERESTED IN TAKNG OTHER COURSES AT OUR COLLEGE?

Item D-3

PLAN TO TAKE COURSES	District		ARC		CRC		SCC	
	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS	GRAD	NRS
Yes	61.5%	69.9%	62.5%	73.0%	54.1%	70.0%	62.2%	64.0%
No	38.5%	30.1%	37.5%	27.0%	45.9%	30.0%	37.8%	36.0%

Interest in Additional Courses

Respondents were also asked whether they were interested in taking other courses at the college conducting the survey, and to identify the courses of interest to them. As shown in Table 27, more than 60% of GRADs and almost 70% of NRSs indicated they would like to take additional courses in the future.

General Comments

The last item on the survey invited comments regarding how college courses and services could be improved, and many respondents took the time to offer their suggestions.

While neither the names of desired courses nor the general comments were keyed for computer analysis, they may be summarized for internal use when fiscal resources permit. Meanwhile, the individual questionnaires may be inspected in the office of the Dean of Occupational Education at each college.

CONCLUSIONS

Alumni of American River College, Cosumnes River College, and Sacramento City College who responded to this survey indicated a high degree of satisfaction with their college experience. Most were employed in a field related to their college training and reported that the training had been of benefit in that employment. A substantial number were also enrolled in further education, and indicated that their community college courses had prepared them well for that endeavor.

No "typical" respondent emerged from this study; respondents were diverse in both their educational goals and their demographic characteristics. There were distinct differences among the three colleges as well as between the two subgroups surveyed. This diversity must be addressed as college and district programs and priorities are developed.

While the methods used previously in the Los Rios Distict to gather follow-up data for federal reporting purposes have met more than minimum requirements, this project has provided a large amount of additional information which should be useful to the colleges and the district in future educational planning. The procedures described here, with slight revisions, could form the basis for even more valuable follow-up studies in future years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following general recommendations are based on the experience of conducting this survey as well as the results obtained. Specific suggestions for implementation are included in the Appendix.

It is recommended that the following procedures used in this study be continued:

1. The annual follow-up of former occupational education students which is mandated for federal and state reporting should also be used to gather additional information useful in college and district planning.

2. The survey should be conducted as a coordinated, district-wide effort using common forms and methods.

3. Questionnaires should be mailed by and returned to the respective colleges; results should be summarized in one report indicating both district and college data.

4. The survey should include all occupational education programs offered in the district, rather than just those for which VEDS reports are required in a given year.

It is recommended that the following new or revised procedures be adopted as a means by which to greatly improve the quality and quantity of information gathered through this survey at relatively nominal or no extra cost.

1. The survey population should include all who received a degree or certificate during the time period being surveyed.

2. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of a random sample of nonreturning general education/liberal arts students in the survey, since a relatively small percentage of community college students actually complete a degree or certificate.

3. The method used to identify the former student's major field of study should be revised to more accurately reflect (for graduates and certificate earners) the program actually completed.

4. Development of survey forms and processing of responses should be handled within the district. Questionnaires specific to the needs of Los Rios should be developed, revising the Tex-SIS data elements as appropriate, with data analysis to be done using SPSS.

5. A plan for regular, systematic dissemination and utilization of survey results should be developed and implemented.

6. Procedures should be developed and utilized to increase the response rate on future follow-up studies in the district.

7. Student follow-up activites in the Los Rios district should be coordinated by a committee which includes district-wide representation of all those who produce or use the data obtained.

8. This annual survey should form the nucleus of a comprehensive long-range plan for student follow-up in the Los Rios district, with other research needs to be identified and coordinated with the data available through this study.

REFERENCES

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.

Bers, John A. "Integrating Student Follow-Up into the Institutional Planning Process: A Case Study." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (Boston, MA, April 9, 1980).

Brooks, Walter. Student and Employer Follow-Up: An Assessment of California Community Colleges' Ability to Comply with Vocational Education Data System Requirements. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1982.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. California Community College Students Who Transfer. A Continuation of Through the Open Door: A Study of Patterns of Enrollment and Performance in California's Community Colleges. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission. 1979.

Corbitt, Gail. First Year of ARAP-SIS: A Summary of the Results from a Comprehensive Student Follow-Up System. Littleton, CO: Arapahoe Community College. 1979.

DeVault, Mike, and Marilyn Lee. Texas Student Information System Graduate/Completer 1977 Sub-System: A Follow-Up Study. Austin: Department of Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency. 1978.

Gray, Robert J., and others. Student-Outcomes Questionnaires: An Implementation Handbook. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. 1979.

Guthart, Jeanette. What Happened to the Class of 1973? A Follow-Up Study of Day and Evening First-time Freshmen Students at San Jose City College, Fall 1973. San Jose (CA) Community College District. 1978.

Hall, Toni, and Jim Reed. Nonreturning Students Data Summary--1976-77. Tex-SIS Follow-Up: Postsecondary Student Follow-Up Management Information System, Monograph 10. Austin: Texas Education Agency. 1979.

Illinois Community College Board. A Statewide Follow-Up Study of Fall 1973 Transfer Students from Illinois Public Community Colleges. Springfield: Illinois Community College Board. 1977.

Los Angeles Community College District. The Fall 1980 Student Survey. Office of Educational Planning and Resource Development, Los Angeles Community College District. 1980.

Maryland State Board for Community Colleges. Maryland Community Colleges 1982 Program Evaluations. Annapolis: Maryland State Board for Community Colleges. 1983.

McCarty, Lisa. A Comparison of Student Trends at Kansas Community Colleges with JCCC (Johnson County Community College). Topeka: Kansas Association of Community Colleges. 1979.

Morris, William. Student Accountability Model (SAM) Operations Manual. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1981.

Oregon State Department of Education. 1976 Community College Follow-Up Survey Summary of Findings. Salem: Oregon State Department of Education, Career and Vocational Education Section. 1977.

Rasor, Richard A. Why Students Drop Classes and Withdraw from American River College. Sacramento: Office of Research and Development, American River College. 1980.

_____. The Opinions and Goals of Current ARC Students. Sacramento: Office of Research and Development, American River College. 1982.

_____ and Jeannie McGill. Follow-Up of American River College 1977 Alumni. Sacramento: Office of Research and Development, American River College. 1981.

Renkiewicz, Nancy K., and others. The Reverse Transfer Student: An Emerging Population. Sacramento: Los Rios Community College District and Northern California Cooperative Institutional Research Group. 1982.

Sheldon, M. Stephen. Guest Editorial, The News of the California Association of Community Colleges, January 1983, p. 4.

_____. Statewide Longitudinal Study: 1978-1981 Final Report. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1982.

_____, and Clive L. Grafton. "Everything you always wanted to know about California community college students...and thought you already did." California Higher Education, November 1982, pp. 14-16.

Slark, Julie. Longitudinal Study of Student Flow. Santa Ana, CA: Institutional Research Office, Santa Ana College. 1979.

Smolen, Diane, and Charles H. Bettinson. "College Wide Former Student Follow-Up Study." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 8, 1979).

Southern Regional Education Board. Follow-Up Surveys of College Graduates: Procedures and Common Core of Questions, Two-Year Institutions. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board. 1978.

U. S. Office of Education. Survey of 1976-77 Graduates, Hawaii Community Colleges. Student Flow Project, Report No. 35. Washington: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1978.

Williams, William G. and Fred A. Snyder. Follow-Up Studies of Former Occupational-Technical Students at Community Colleges. Richmond: Virginia Department of Community Colleges. 1974.

APPENDIX

TX8-3-C (GRAD-1 DeVAULT) Term:

Tex-SIS FOLLOW-UP

PROJECT FOLLOW-UP

Please make corrections to the information above if necessary.

FOR COLLEGE USE ONLY

Term Date: Mo (16 17) Yr (20 21)

Completion Code (73)

Group Code (88): A O/T; B UT; C OTH; D VC

Course Type Code (74): 1 Coop; 2 Non-Coop

Target Pop. Code (75): 1 REG; 2 DAVT; 3 HNCP; 4 LEP

Major Code (84 85 86 87)

Level Code (76): 2 Postsecondary; 3 Adult–LT; 4 Adult–ST; 5 OTH

Special Code (45)

Note: This survey is authorized by Public Laws 20 USC 2312 and 20 USC 2391. While you are not required to respond to this survey, your cooperation is needed to insure that the results of this effort are comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BLOCK(S) WITHIN EACH CATEGORY BELOW.

SECTION A

EVERYONE SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION.

Do not write in this column

Please respond to the below as appropriate. This information is needed for equal opportunity education and employment reporting

MAJOR _____

SEX (46): B Male; F Female

ETHNIC GROUP (66): 5 American Indian or Alaskan Native; 4 Asian or Pacific Islander; 3 Black, not of Hispanic Origin; 2 Hispanic; 1 White, not of Hispanic Origin; 9 Nonresident Alien

AGE (67): B 16-19; C 20-24; D 25-29; E 30-34; F 35-44; G 45-54; H 55-64; I 65 and over

1 What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our two-year college?

46-1 Improvement of existing "job skills"
47-1 Preparation for "job to be obtained"
48-1 University transfer credit
49-1 Personal interest
50-1 Other (describe) _____

2 What is your current educational status? (Check one)

51: 1 Currently attending school; 2 Not currently attending school

3 What is your current employment status? (Check one)

52: 1 Employed (Includes all employment, even if below your qualifications; **does not include full-time military service**); 2 Employed (Full-time military service); 3 Unemployed (Not employed, but actively seeking employment); 4 Not in labor force (Not employed and not seeking employment because of choice, illness, full-time student status, retirement, pregnancy, or other such reason)

4 If you have completed courses in your MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY please rate them according to how well they fulfilled your individual needs. Students with "undecided undeclared" majors should skip to next question.

	Very Good 1	Good 2	Average 3	Poor 4	Very Poor 5
a. Quality of instruction (53)					
b. Grading/Testing (54)					
c. Instructor interest (55)					
d. Content of course(s) (56)					
e. Instructional media (57)					
f. Class size (58)					

5 If you have used any of the below college services, please rate them according to how well they fulfilled your individual needs.

Do not write in this column

	Very Good 1	Good 2	Average 3	Poor 4	Very Poor 5
a. Financial aids (59)					
b. Counseling (60)					
c. Job placement services (61)					
d. Course advisement (62)					
e. Tutoring services (63)					
f. Veterans services (64)					
g. Learning lab/packages (65)					
h. Student activities (66)					
i. Library services (67)					

SECTION B

IF YOU HAVE ENROLLED IN ANOTHER COLLEGE SINCE YOUR ENROLLMENT AT OUR COLLEGE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION.

Do not write in this column

1 Please provide the below information on your current (or most recently attended) college.

TC (68)

Name of College (69)

City and State (70)

Your Current Major Field of Study (71)

(72)

(73)

2 Did you have problems transferring to the college indicated above?

74: 1 Yes; what? 2 No

TRSC (34)

78-1 Transferring credit hours (35)
78-1 Transcript problems (36)
77-1 Admission problems (37)
78-1 Other (describe) _____

OVER PLEASE!

BELOW SPACE RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

MAJOR CODE

3 How many credit hours earned at our college were not accepted at the college indicated above?

(43)
1 All credit hours accepted
2 Last 1 - 3 credit hours
3 Last 4 - 6 credit hours
4 Last 7 - 12 credit hours
5 Last 13 - 21 credit hours
6 Last more than 21 credit hours

Do not write in this column

4 If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS (43)
1 Part-time student (Less than 12 hours)
2 Full-time student (12 or more hours)

CLASSIFICATION (44)
1 Junior
2 Senior
3 Graduate student
4 Other _____

5 How well did the courses you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

(45)
1 My preparation was excellent
2 My preparation was satisfactory
3 Good in some areas only
4 Fair, but all areas could have been better
5 My preparation was inadequate

SECTION C

IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, OR IN FULL-TIME MILITARY SERVICE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION D.

1 Please provide the following information on your present job.

Name of Company or Firm (If self-employed, please write self.)

Company or Firm Mailing Address

City State (58) Zip Code

Your Job Title

Your Job Duties

2 Is this job related to the courses you have completed at our college?

(59)
1 Yes, it is directly or closely related
2 No, it is only remotely related or is not related at all

3 What is your current salary (gross)? (Do not add in overtime.) This information, when combined with others in your field of study, will provide valuable information to other individuals in their own career planning.

(Check one)

$. (64) PER (71) 1 HOUR 2 WEEK 3 MONTH 4 YEAR

4 The salary in the preceding item is based on how many hours per week employment?

(72-73) Hours per Week

Dates of Employment From _____ To _____

5 We periodically conduct surveys of employers to help us evaluate the courses we offer and to advise us on other courses and programs which are needed. If we may contact your immediate supervisor so he or she can have the opportunity to participate in such a survey, please supply the below information.

Supervisor's Last Name First Name M.I.

Supervisor's Job Title

Please provide address if different from your company address

(46-70) SEC

(71-73) SUP

(74-78) SUP

6 How would you rate the training you received at our college in relation to its usefulness to you in performing your job?

(43)
1 Very good
2 Good
3 Average
4 Poor
5 Very poor

Do not write in this column

7 Please check below if the course(s) you took at our college helped you in your occupational area in any of the following ways.

44-1 Helped to obtain job
45-1 Helped performance on present job
46-1 Helped advance on present job
47-1 None of the above
48-1 Other (describe) _____

8 Were you employed in your occupational area PRIOR to enrolling in the course(s) completed at our college?

(49)
1 No
2 Yes

9 How would you rate the availability of jobs in your occupational area?

(50)
1 Very good
2 Good
3 Average
4 Poor
5 Very poor

SECTION D

ALL STUDENTS SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION.

1 If your occupational area is NOT related to the courses you have completed at our college (as indicated in Section C) please check each reason which applies. If occupational area is related to courses completed, go to Question 2.

51-1 Transferred to a four-year college
52-1 Not sufficiently qualified for a job in my field of college preparation
53-1 Preferred to work in another field
54-1 Found better paying job in another field
55-1 Could not find a job in field of preparation
56-1 Worked previously in field of preparation, but changed
57-1 Other (describe) _____

2 How do you see the course(s) completed at our college in terms of your career plans:

58-1 of immediate, direct benefit
59-1 of long term, direct benefit
60-1 of indirect benefit
61-1 of no benefit

3 Are you interested in taking other courses at our college? You may include courses not presently offered by our college.

(62)
1 No
2 Yes; what course(s)? _____

4 We would appreciate any comments regarding how we could improve the course(s) you have completed and/or services we have provided. Please use the below space (front and back) for your comments.

GRAD-1 DeVAULT

BELOW SPACE RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

(Use reverse side for additional space)

THANK YOU FOR ASSISTING US IN OUR SURVEY! PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE PREPAID ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

TX8-1-C (NRS-DaVAULT) Term:

Tex-SIS FOLLOW-UP

PROJECT FOLLOW-UP

Please make corrections to the information above if necessary.

FOR COLLEGE USE ONLY

Term Date: Mo. 16-17 Yr. 20-21

Completion Code: 22

Group Code: 19 — A O/T; B LT; C OTEP; D VEC

Course Type Code: 74 — 1 Coop; 2 Non-Coop

Target Pop. Code: 75 — 1 RKG; 2 DAVT; 3 HNCP; 4 LEP

Major Code: 84-87

Level Code: 76 — 1 Postsecondary; 3 Adult—LT; 4 Adult—ST; 5 OTH

Special Code: 88

Note: This survey is authorized by Public Laws 20 USC 2312 and 20 USC 2391. While you are not required to respond to this survey, your cooperation is needed to insure that the results of this effort are comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BLOCK(S) WITHIN EACH CATEGORY BELOW.

SECTION A

EVERYONE SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION

Please respond to the below as appropriate. This information is needed for equal opportunity education and employment reporting.

MAJOR _____

SEX: 66 — M Male; F Female

ETHNIC GROUP: 67 — 1 American Indian or Alaskan Native; 4 Asian or Pacific Islander; 2 Black, not of Hispanic Origin; 3 Hispanic; 5 White, not of Hispanic Origin; 6 Nonresident Alien

AGE: 68 — A 16-19; B 20-24; C 25-29; D 30-34; E 35-39; F 40-44; G 45-54; H 55-64; I 65 and over

Do not write in this column

1 What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our two-year college?

- 46-1 Improvement of existing "job skills"
- 47-1 Preparation for "job to be obtained"
- 48-1 University transfer credit
- 49-1 Personal interest
- 50-1 Other (describe) _____

2 To what extent has this objective been completed?

51 — 1 Fully completed; 2 Partially completed; 3 Not completed

3 Do you plan to pursue this objective further?

52 — 1 Yes, where? ▶ 52-1 At our college; 84-1 At another college; 86-1 Other (describe) _____; 2 No

4 How much education is (or was) required to accomplish your educational objective at our college?

- 66-1 Selected course(s)
- 67-1 Certificate program
- 68-1 Two-year associate degree program
- 69-1 Other (describe) _____

5 What was your principal reason for NOT re-enrolling at our college this semester?

- 60-1 Completed needed courses
- 61-1 Transportation problems
- 62-1 Transferred to another college
- 63-1 Found job in occupation related to course(s) completed at this college
- 64-1 Conflicting job hours
- 65-1 Financial reasons
- 66-1 Change of residence
- 67-1 Grade problems
- 68-1 Dissatisfied with instruction
- 69-1 Dissatisfied with content of courses
- 70-1 Personal family illness or injury
- 71-1 Other personal family reasons
- 72-1 Other (describe) _____

6 Which statement best describes your feeling about your educational experience at our college?

70 — 1 Very satisfied; 2 Satisfied; 3 Average; 4 Disappointed; 5 Very disappointed

Do not write in this column

7 If you have completed courses in your MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY please rate them according to how well they fulfilled your individual needs. Students with "undecided/undeclared" majors should skip to next question.

	Very Good 1	Good 2	Average 3	Poor 4	Very Poor 5
a. Quality of instruction (74)					
b. Grading/Testing (75)					
c. Instructor interest (76)					
d. Content of course(s) (77)					
e. Instructional media (78)					
f. Class size (79)					

8 If you have used any of the below college services, please rate them according to how well they fulfilled your individual needs.

	Very Good 1	Good 2	Average 3	Poor 4	Very Poor 5
a. Financial aids (34)					
b. Counseling (35)					
c. Job placement services (36)					
d. Course advisement (37)					
e. Tutoring services (38)					
f. Veterans services (39)					
g. Learning lab packages (40)					
h. Student activities (41)					
i. Library services (42)					

9 What is your current educational status? (Check one)

45 — 1 Currently attending school; 2 Not currently attending school

10 What is your current employment status? (Check one)

44 — 1 Employed (Includes all employment, even if below your qualifications; does not include full-time military service); 2 Employed (Full-time military service); 3 Unemployed (Not employed, but actively seeking employment); 4 Not in labor force (Not employed and not seeking employment because of choice, illness, full-time student status, retirement, pregnancy, or other such reason)

OVER PLEASE!

BELOW SPACE RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

MAJOR CODE

SECTION B

IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, OR IN FULL-TIME MILITARY SERVICE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION C.

Do not write in this column.

1 Please provide the following information on your present job.

Name of Company or Firm (If self-employed, please write self.)

Company or Firm Mailing Address

City State (57) Zip Code

Your Job Title

Your Job Duties

2 Is this job related to the courses you have completed at our college?

1 Yes, it is directly or closely related
2 No, it is only remotely related or is not related at all

3 What is your current salary (gross)? (Do not add in overtime.) This information, when combined with others in your field of study, will provide valuable information to other individuals in their own career planning.

$ _____ (48) PER (Check one) (49) 1 HOUR 2 WEEK 3 MONTH 4 YEAR

4 The salary in the preceding item is based on how many hours per week employment?

_____ (50-51) HOURS PER WEEK

5 We periodically conduct surveys of employers to help us evaluate the courses we offer and to advise us on other courses and programs which are needed. If we may contact your immediate supervisor so he or she can have the opportunity to participate in such a survey, please supply the below information.

Supervisor's Last Name First Name M.I.

Supervisor's Job Title

Please provide address if different from your company address

6 Please check below if the course(s) you took at our college helped you in your occupational area in any of the following ways.

48-1 Helped to obtain job
44-1 Helped performance on present job
45-1 Helped advance on present job
46-1 None of the above
47-1 Other (describe) _____

7 How would you rate the training you received at our college in relation to its usefulness to you in performing your job?

48 1 Very good 2 Good 3 Average 4 Poor 5 Very poor

8 Would you recommend the course(s) taken at our college to others employed in positions similar to yours?

49 1 No 2 Undecided 3 Yes

9 Were you employed in your occupational area PRIOR to enrolling in the course(s) completed at our college?

50 1 No 2 Yes

SECTION C

IF YOU HAVE ENROLLED IN ANOTHER COLLEGE SINCE YOUR ENROLLMENT AT OUR COLLEGE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION D.

Do not write in this column.

1 Please provide the below information on your current (or most recently attended) college.

Name of College

City and State

Your Current Major Field of Study

2 Did you have problems transferring to the college indicated above?

66 1 Yes: what? → 66-1 Transferring credit hours; 67-1 Transcript problems; 68-1 Admission problems; 69-1 Other (describe) _____
2 No

3 How many credit hours earned at our college were not accepted at the college indicated above?

70 1 All credit hours accepted; 2 Lost 1 - 3 credit hours; 3 Lost 4 - 6 credit hours; 4 Lost 7 - 12 credit hours; 5 Lost 13 - 21 credit hours; 6 Lost more than 21 credit hours

4 In your opinion, how well did our college prepare you for continuing your education?

71 1 Very good 2 Good 3 Average 4 Poor 5 Very poor

5 If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS: 72 1 Part-time student (Less than 12 hours); 2 Full-time student (12 or more hours)

CLASSIFICATION: 73 1 Freshman 2 Sophomore 3 Junior 4 Senior 5 Graduate student

SECTION D

ALL STUDENTS SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION.

1 Approximately how many credit and/or clock hours have you completed at our college? Please mark appropriate column.

CREDIT HOURS		CLOCK HOURS	
74 1	None	75 1	None
2	1 - 10	2	1 - 500
3	11 - 20	3	501 - 1000
4	21 - 30	4	1001 - 1500
5	31 - 40	5	1501 - 2000
6	41 - 50	6	2001 - 2500
7	51 - 60	7	2501 - 3000
8	More than 60	8	More than 3000

2 How do you see the course(s) completed at our college in terms of your career plans:

76-1 of immediate, direct benefit
77-1 of long term, direct benefit
78-1 of indirect benefit
79-1 of no benefit

3 Are you interested in taking other courses at our college? You may include courses not presently offered by our college.

80 1 No 2 Yes: what course(s)? _____

4 We would appreciate any comments regarding how we could improve the course(s) you have completed and or services we have provided. Please use the below space (front and back) for your comments.

NRS-DeVAULT

BELOW SPACE RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

Page 43a

BACK SIDE OF NRS FORM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

65

(Use reverse side for additional space)

THANK YOU FOR ASSISTING US IN OUR SURVEY! PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE PRE-PAID ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE!

(Cover Letter, First Mailing)

(Your college letterhead)

February 23, 1983

Hello:

_____* _____* College needs your help! As a former student, you can provide important information that will help us improve our service to the community.

We would like to know how satisfied you were with your experiences here and what your educational needs are for the future. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the prepaid envelope within ten days.

The data you and others provide will be summarized to help us improve our programs and services, but your individual responses will be held in strict confidence.

Your participation in this survey is important. By responding promptly, you may be helping your children, a friend or neighbor, or perhaps yourself, if you attend *C in the future.

If you have questions about the survey, give us a call at _____. Meanwhile, thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

President

Dean of Occupational Education

Enclosures

*Individual college name or initial

(Second Cover Letter)

(College letterhead)

(Date)

Hello!

Recently we sent you a Project Follow-Up survey form and asked that you complete and return it. We have not yet received your reply.

Your response is important. We want the survey results to reflect the opinions of all our former students, so we would like to hear from you. Please help us by taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the postpaid envelope. Your answers will be held in confidence, and only summarized information will be reported.

This is your opportunity to help _____* _____* College evaluate and improve its programs and services. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Please respond today!

If you have already sent your reply, please accept our thanks.

Sincerely,

Dean of Occupational Education

President

Enclosures

*Individual college name

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

GRAD Forms

	ARC	CRC	SCC	District
Forms Mailed	706	123	421	1,250
Forms Undelivered by P.O.	-51	-18	-58	-127
Net Delivered Forms	655	105	363	1,123
Responses by April 7*	383	72	208	663
Late Responses	+19	+3	+11	+33
Total Responses	402	75	219	696
Adjusted Response Rate (April 7)	58.5%	68.6%	57.3%	59.0%
Adjusted Response Rate (Final)	61.4%	71.4%	60.3%	62.0%

NRS Forms

	ARC	CRC	SCC	District
Forms Mailed	661	372	417	1,450
Forms Undelivered by P.O.	-32	-11	-36	-79
Net Delivered Forms	629	361	381	1,371
Responses by April 7	277	131	148	556
Late Responses	+13	+8	+18	+39
Total Responses	290	139	166	595
Adjusted Response Rate (April 7)	44.0%	36.3%	38.8%	40.6%
Adjusted Response Rate (Final)	46.1%	38.5%	43.6%	43.4%

Combined Totals

	ARC	CRC	SCC	District
Forms Mailed	1,367	495	838	2,700
Total Undelivered	-83	-29	-94	-206
Net Delivered Forms	1,284	466	744	2,494
Responses by April 7	660	203	356	1,219
Late Responses	+32	+11	+29	+72
Total Responses	692	214	385	1,291
Adjusted Response Rate (April 7)	51.4%	43.6%	47.8%	48.9%
Adjusted Response Rate (Final)	53.9%	45.9%	51.7%	51.8%

*Deadline to send forms to Tex-SIS for processing

RESPONSES BY MAJOR*

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	USOE* Code	Tex-SIS* Code	LRCCD COLLEGE	Responses GRAD	NRS
AGRICULTURE/NATURAL RESOURCES					
Animal Health Technology	01.9900	5023	CRC	11	0
Animal Science/Agriculture	01.0200	0104	CRC	2	2
Forestry	01.0600	5034	ARC	0	3
Horticulture	01.0500	5026	ARC	4	5
ARCHITECTURE/ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN					
Architecture/Env. Design	16.0103	0202	CRC	3	10
Solar/Environmental Design	17.1099	8442	CRC	1	5
BUSINESS/MANAGEMENT/OFFICE ADMIN.					
Accounting	14.0100	0502	SCC	13	17
Accounting/General Business	14.0100	0502	CRC	7	33
Accounting Technician	14.0100	0502	ARC	37	19
Admin. Housekeeping Mgt.	09.0205	1307	ARC	0	4
Advertising	04.0100	5426	SCC	1	0
Banking and Finance	04.0400	0504	ARC	3	0
Food Service Management	09.0203	1306	ARC	5	5
Insurance	04.1300	5428	ARC	1	6
Management	14.0800	0506	ARC	26	3
Management	14.0800	0506	SCC	13	4
Management/General Business	14.0800	0506	CRC	1	0
Marketing	04.0800	0509	ARC	8	0
Merchandising	04.0800	0509	SCC	1	0
Office Administration	14.0700	5824	ARC	18	14
Office Administration	14.0700	5824	CRC	2	0
Office Administration	14.0700	5824	SCC	14	4
Office Adm.--Clerical	14.0300	5823	SCC	0	0
Office Training, General	14.0300	5823	ARC	13	0
Office Training, General	14.0300	5823	CRC	7	0
Real Estate	04.1700	0511	ARC	6	38
Real Estate	04.1700	0511	SCC	8	16

*Computer printouts summarizing responses by major are filed numerically by Tex-SIS Code; questionnaires are filed numerically by USOE Code.

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	USOE Code	Tex-SIS Code	LRCCD COLLEGE	Responses GRAD	NRS
COMMUNICATIONS/JOURNALISM					
Communications Media	16.9900	0600	CRC	10	19
Community Journalism	14.0400	0602	ARC	5	0
Photography/Comm. Media	17.0900	1011	CRC	1	8
COMPUTER/INFORMATION SCIENCE					
Business Data Processing	16.0117	9021	ARC	33	13
Data Processing	14.0299	9021	SCC	11	18
Data Processing/Small Bus.	14.0201	9021	CRC	2	0
EDUCATION/PHYSICAL EDUCATION					
Recreation/Leisure Ldrship.	04.1800	2103	ARC	9	4
FINE AND APPLIED ARTS					
Fashion Careers	09.0202	1303	ARC	2	15
Graphic Design Option/Art	17.0700	1002	CRC	1	0
Interior Design	09.0204	5225	ARC	4	0
HEALTH PROFESSIONS/ALLIED HEALTH					
Dental Assisting	07.0101	8023	SCC	3	0
Dental Hygiene	07.0102	8034	SCC	5	7
Medical Assisting	07.0904	8026	CRC	0	5
Nursing, ADN	07.0301	8021	SCC	12	4
Nursing, LVN	07.0302	7821	SCC	14	1
Nursing, RN	07.0301	8021	ARC	40	3
Respiratory Therapy	07.0903	8025	ARC	7	1
HOME ECON., FAMILY/CONSUMER SCIENCE					
Early Childhood Education	09.0201	1305	ARC	27	3
Early Childhood Education	09.0201	1305	SCC	11	4
Family/Consumer Science	09.0299	1304	SCC	18	23
Family/Consumer Sci. (Gen.)	09.0205	1304	CRC	7	0
LAW/LEGAL ASSISTING					
Legal Assisting	14.9900	5828	ARC	9	5

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	USOE Code	Tex-SIS Code	LRCCD COLLEGE	Responses GRAD	NRS
LIBRARY SCIENCE/LIBRARY TECH.					
Library Technology	14.0400	9424	SCC	1	0
OCCUPATIONAL/TRADE TECHNOLOGIES					
Automotive Mechanics Tech.	17.0302	6422	CRC	9	24
Aviation Maintenance Tech.	17.0400	6621	SCC	12	17
Constr. Suprvision Inspect.	17.2899	0516	CRC	1	1
Constr. Mgt. Technology	16.0106	8441	CRC	2	3
Cosmetology	17.2602	6227	SCC	16	1
Design Drafting/Env. Design	17.1300	6229	CRC	0	11
Drafting	17.1300	6229	ARC	4	4
Drafting	17.1300	6229	SCC	2	3
Electronics	16.0108	8824	ARC	70	9
Electronics	16.0108	8824	SCC	9	1
Engineering Technology	16.0106	8441	ARC	11	1
Fire Technology	17.2801	6821	ARC	17	68
Fire Technology	17.2801	6821	CRC	0	2
General Technology	16.0106	8441	SCC	1	0
Mechanical-Electrical Tech.	16.0113	7221	SCC	15	1
Mechanics (Auto Body)	17.0301	6421	ARC	2	4
Mechanics (Automotive)	17.0302	6422	ARC	5	8
Mechanics (Diesel)	17.1200	6423	ARC	1	3
Metals Industry Technology	17.2302	6234	SCC	0	0
Printing Technology	17.1900	6238	SCC	2	0
Surveying Technology	17.1700	8435	SCC	3	0
Welding	17.2306	6245	ARC	1	3
Wood Technology	17.3600	0839	ARC/P	0	1
PHYSICAL SCIENCES					
Geological Technology	16.0110	1914	CRC	5	0
PROTECTIVE AND SOCIAL SERVICES					
Administration of Justice	16.0605	2105	ARC/P	4	4
Administration of Justice	16.0605	2105	SCC	23	27
Human Services	17.2899	2104	ARC	7	12
Human Services	17.2899	2104	CRC	0	8
Sign Language Studies	07.0400	9623	ARC	4	19
TOTAL RESPONSES				663	556

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are suggestions for implementing the recommendations for new or revised procedures outlined on pages 37-38 of this report.

Selection of Survey Population

With respect to graduates and certificate earners:

1. Include in the survey all who received a degree or certificate during the semesters being studied (general education/liberal arts as well as occupational majors). This would improve the accuracy of the data regarding occupational education students, as well as providing the colleges and the district with considerable additional information with relatively little additional cost.

2. Include these alumni in the survey immediately following the award of their degree or certificate, even though they may reenroll the following semester to pursue some additional goal. This conforms to a recommendation in the SAM Operations Manual (July, 1981, p. 34).

With respect to nonreturning students:

3. Continue to use the existing computer program to to identify occupational education "achievers" as described in VEDS guidelines.

4. In consultation with research and data processing staff, devise a method for selecting a random sample of other nonreturning students to be included in the survey population.

5. Design the survey to permit identification and analysis of responses from "achievers" as a discrete segment of the nonreturning student group being studied, to preserve the integrity of VEDS data.

Identification of Major

1. To identify the former student's major, use the list of degrees and certificates actually awarded by the respective colleges and posted to each student's Computer-Generated Permanent Record (CGPR), rather than the major projected by the SAM matrix.

2. Include a questionnaire item asking respondents to indicate their major; compare with major shown on printout and correct if necessary to reflect the major on which responses are based.

Questionnaires and Survey Procedures

1. Develop questionnaires specific to the needs of Los Rios, revising the data elements from the Tex-SIS forms and other surveys to meet local needs.

2. Continue to use color-coded forms to differentiate graduates from nonreturning students.

3. Organize questionnaires and data entry procedures to permit SPSS comparisons of various subpopulations (GRAD with NRS; occupational education majors with general education/liberal arts students, etc.).

4. Provide for inclusion of some data elements on only one form (GRAD or NRS) as appropriate to the population being studied; items common to both forms should be worded identically and, insofar as possible, arranged in the same order.

5. Include demographic and summary information on the computer printout of the survey population, to permit later comparison with responses received in order to determine non-response bias.

6. Code the mailing labels to indicate special status (disadvantaged or handicapped) as well as major and completion status.

7. Develop and use a form for easy and consistent recording of questionnaires mailed, number undelivered by post office (by major field), and responses received.

Increasing Rate of Return

1. Inform currently enrolled students about the college's follow-up program, encouraging them to participate when they are contacted later. Suggested procedures:

a. Use student newspapers and local media on an ongoing basis to publicize plans for and/or results of follow-up activities.

b. Enlist Student Association cooperation in publicizing the value of continued contact with the college after leaving.

c. Work through Faculty Senates and instructional program areas to obtain faculty support in alerting students to the value of their participation in follow-up activities.

2. Develop and use a distinctive logo on all follow-up forms and correspondence.

3. Use a questionnaire that is professionally type-set and which highlights the name of the individual college as well as indentifying the district. Printing can be done at each college as needed.

4. Continue to use the signature of the student's area dean as well as the college president on follow-up cover letters.

5. Continue to send a second questionnaire with a revised cover letter to those who have not responded within two weeks.

6. Continue to use first class postage for both initial and second mailings.

7. Develop procedure to update student address and telephone number in computerized data files retained for research purposes:

   a. Enter address corrections from responses received.

   b. Consider use of DMV files to update addresses.

8. Retain student enrollment data in the district computer longer than is presently done to permit long-range follow-up activities (length of time to be determined by district data processor users/research committees).

SPRING 1983 STUDENT FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Summary of Data Elements

A comparison of the Tex-SIS survey forms used in the Spring 1983 Follow-Up of Occupational Students with the form used by the Los Rios District for the comparable follow-up in 1982 reveals the following:

1. The Tex-SIS forms retained all data elements required for state and federal reporting purposes, as well as several other items of general interest (see Section 1 below).

2. The Tex-SIS forms included 24 additional items regarding students' objectives, satisfaction with services, further education, employment, and future plans (Section 2).

3. Only seven data elements from the old LRCCD form were omitted by using the Tex-SIS form (Section 3).

Abbreviations: GRAD = Tex-SIS form used for grads/certificate earners
NRS = Tex-SIS form used for non-returning students

Section 1: DATA ELEMENTS RETAINED FROM LRCCD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Demographic Information: Age, Sex, Ethnicity
2. Special Status (Handicapped/Limited English/Disadvantaged)
3. Award Completed (AA Degree/Certificate)
4. Major (Based on USOE Code/SAM matrix)
5. Units Completed (NRS form only)
6. Continuing Education Status
7. Name of College/University (if any)
8. Employment Status
9. Employer Name and Mailing Address
10. Job Title
11. Salary
12. Hours Per Week Employed
13. Employed in field of training or related field?
14. If not working in field of training, explain. (GRAD form only)
15. How well did training prepare you for your job?
16. Rating of Instruction Program
17. Rating of Job Placement Service
18. Rating of Counseling Services
19. Suggestions for Improvement of Programs and Services
20. Space for Comments

Section 2: ADDITIONAL DATA ELEMENTS ON Tex-SIS FORMS, NOT ON LRCCD FORM

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. Request for update of student's address
2. Request for student-entered major (often different from label)

STUDENT OBJECTIVES/SATISFACTION:

3. What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our college?
4. To what extent has this objective been completed? (NRS only)
5. Do you plan to pursue this objective further? Where? (NRS only)
6. Education required to complete objective at our college? (NRS only)
7. Principal reason for NOT re-enrolling this semester? (NRS only)
8. Satisfaction you feel about your educational experience? (NRS only)
9. Rating of COURSES COMPLETED in MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY:
   a) Quality of instruction
   b) Grading/Testing
   c) Instructor interest
   d) Content of course(s)
   e) Instructional media
   f) Class size
10. Rating of COLLEGE SERVICES utilized:
   a) Financial aids
   b) Course advisement
   c) Tutoring services
   d) Veterans services
   e) Learning lab/packages
   f) Student activities
   g) Library services

FURTHER EDUCATION (Complete if enrolled since attending our college):

11. Address of institution?
12. Major field of study at college indicated above?
13. Did you have problems transferring to above college? If yes, what?
   a) Transferring credit hours
   b) Transcript problems
   c) Admission problems
   d) Other (describe)_____
14. Number of units from our college not accepted at above college?
15. Status (FT/PT) and class standing at college indicated above.
16. How well did our college prepare you for continuing your education?

EMPLOYMENT STATUS (Complete if employed):

17. Describe your job duties _____.
18. We periodically conduct surveys; if we may contact, please provide information regarding immediate supervisor (name/title/address).
19. Did course(s) taken at this college help in your occupational area (obtain job; perform/advance on present job)?
20. Would you recommend the course(s) taken at our college to others employed in positions similar to yours? (NRS only)
21. Employed in your occupational area PRIOR to enrolling at our college?
22. Rate availability of jobs in your occupational area? (GRAD form only)

FUTURE PLANS:

23. Relationship of courses taken at our college to career plans?
24. Are you interested in taking other courses at our college?
    If yes, indicate courses: _____.

Section 3: LRCCD DATA ELEMENTS OMITTED BY USE OF Tex-SIS FORMS

1. Telephone Number (Number shown on college records is on computer printout checklist; however, no provision for updating.)
2. What was most helpful in obtaining job? (Friends, ads, etc.)
3. What factors were most important in your choice of career goal?
4. Did you have sufficient information in selecting career goal?
5. Since leaving our college, have you changed or considered changing your career goal?
6. Rating of Equipment/Lab Facilities
7. Rating of Work Experience Program

The items in Section 3, along with other possible data elements found in other surveys, will be considered for inclusion in the revised questionnaire being developed for future use in Los Rios.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

APR 20 1984